Nadler
Napolitano
Rush
Tierney
Watt
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1406

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was unavoidably detained during rollcall vote No. 39, the vote on H. Res. 92, providing for consideration of 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, and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules. Had I been present for this vote, I would have voted "aye."

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on adoption of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 17) providing for an adjournment or recess of the two Houses, which the Chair will put de novo.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 176, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

AYES—243

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—176

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Bachmann
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Berkley
Carnahan
Clay
Giffords
Honda
Hoyer
Lewis (GA)
Nadler
Rehberg
Ros-Lehtinen
Sewell
Tierney
Watt
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1413

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1 and insert extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 92 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1.

□ 1414

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes, with Mr. LUCAS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The continuing resolution on the floor today represents the largest reduction in non-security discretionary spending in the history of the Nation. It funds the Federal Government for the remainder of the 2011 fiscal year, but, most importantly, Mr. Chairman, it answers taxpayers' callings to right our Nation's fiscal ship, making specific, substantive and comprehensive spending reductions, cutting more than $100 billion, compared with the President's fiscal 2011 budget request.

This CR reverses a trend of out-of-control Democrat spending over the last 2 years that has increased overall discretionary funding, including stimulus, by 84 percent in 2 years. Never before has Congress undertaken a task of this magnitude, but never before have we been faced with a deficit crisis of this scale. The government is borrowing over 40 cents of every dollar that it spends.

Our constituents sent us a clear, decisive message in the last election. They want government to spend less, stop undue interference in American lives and businesses, and take action to create jobs and get our economy moving again. Through the Republican Pledge to America, we made the commitment to do just that, and today we offer the first step in fulfilling these promises by presenting a spending package to the American people that makes deep but manageable cuts in nearly every area of the government.

This bill is about shared commitments and shared sacrifice. Make no mistake: These cuts will not be easy, and they will affect every congressional district. But they are necessary and long overdue. Although we recognize that every dollar we cut has a constituency of support, an association, an industry, individual citizens who will disagree with our decision, these cuts are the necessary difficult work by our subcommittees to make the smartest and fairest reductions possible.

No stones were left unturned, no programs were held sacred. The Appropriations Committee went line by line to craft a responsible, judicious CR, one that will allow our economy to thrive, our businesses to create jobs and our national security to be strengthened. Our subcommittees scoured the budget for wasteful activities and cleaned out excessive and unnecessary spending, while prioritizing the most essential and effective programs, including $460 million for accelerating the process through which veterans resolve their health care claims and an additional $13 million for increased oversight of the Troubled Asset Relief Program, TARP.

The CR includes absolutely no earmark funding and eliminates all previous earmark funding from fiscal year 2010, saving taxpayers approximately $8.5 billion. Furthermore, it includes a provision to eliminate any unobligated stimulus funding approved in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, another $5 billion of taxpayer dollars saved.

As we help put our Nation's budget back into balance, we are finding real savings that are justifiable to the American people and that will stop the dangerous spiral of unsustainable and irresponsible deficits.

In addition, this CR is only the first of many appropriations bills this year that will significantly trim Federal spending. It is hard-and-fast proof that we are serious about returning our Nation to a sustainable financial and fiscal path.

□ 1420

However, so that we can continue the important work of reducing spending in our regular budgetary work for this year, the House, Senate, and White House must come together to complete this process before March 4, when our current funding measure expires. It is critically important that the House move this CR to avoid a government shutdown and get these spending cuts passed by the House, over to the Senate, and let them act their will to avoid a shutdown, and then get the bill to the President. The American people expect no less.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that a debt crisis is looming. There is no denying that we need a comprehensive plan to reduce the debt over the long term. What the majority offers instead in this bill is a one-dimensional focus on the smallest segment of spending in the Federal budget. We believe that at this time we should be putting everything on the table: discretionary spending, entitlements, and taxes. Without a more comprehensive approach to this debt crisis, we cannot effectively change the trajectory and begin to bring our public debt downward. Without a more comprehensive budgetary approach, what we would be offering to the American people would be what Alan Simpson has called ''a sparrow's belch in the midst of a typhoon.''

As we address the debt crisis, it is fundamental that we should first do no harm to the fragile economic recovery. Here I am just echoing what many others have said. As the bipartisan Fiscal Commission put it, ''In order to avoid shocking the fragile economy, the Commission recommends waiting until 2012 to begin enacting programmatic spending cuts, and waiting until fiscal year 2013 before making large nominal cuts.''

Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke in his testimony last week to the House Budget Committee said, ''To the extent you can change programs that will have long-term effects on spending and revenues, that will be a more effective and credible program than one that focuses only on the current fiscal year. The right way to do this doesn't put too much pressure on the ongoing recovery.''

As the Democratic leader just said, there is a recent analysis done by the Economic Policy Institute that says a full $100 billion cut to discretionary spending would likely result in job losses on the order of 994,000, using OMB's GDP projections and CBO projections based on current law, and assuming a fiscal multiplier of 1.5 percent.

So this is a very serious matter. We Democrats support dealing with waste, fraud, and abuse. We want to see a program. I personally support President Obama's 5-year freeze on domestic spending, with puts and takes, because it doesn't cut as much in the first year. This is all about timing. And I recognize that my colleagues over on this side of the aisle believe and think that what they're doing is going to have a positive economic effect and that this will somehow create economic activity and lower the deficit, lower unemployment. I hope and pray they're right, because if what I think and most economists—reputable economists—think is true, this will have a negative effect and hurt the economy and hurt the people that are out there who are unemployed.

So I think we need to think about this very, very carefully. And cuts of this magnitude, as the chairman said, have never been done before. We are in uncharted waters. We all recognize that we have to have a plan for the deficit. But the plan has to include entitlements, has to include taxes. Discretionary spending is one-third of the budget. You could cut and cut and cut, and you're still not going to solve the problem.

So, hopefully, we can do what we did in the 1980s with Tip O'Neill and Bob Dole, and that is have a bipartisan approach, like they're doing in the Senate today, where Democrats and Republicans get together and work on all of these issues and come up with a credible plan. That is the way to do this.

And I see my good friend, Mr. YOUNG from Florida. I just want to say that I have enjoyed working with him for over 30 years, and I strongly support the defense part of this bill. The defense part of this bill has been worked out on a bipartisan basis by the Defense Subcommittee. It does make reductions in spending but it does it in a very careful and professional way. And I want to commend the gentleman from Florida for his leadership over the years on national security issues.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Republican Conference in the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, if we want to have jobs today, if we want to protect our children from bankruptcy tomorrow,

we've got to quit spending money we don't have. There is a debt crisis in America, and it is spending driven, being led by the President and other friends from the other side of the aisle. It is a true crisis. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mike Mullen, has said the biggest threat we have to our national security is our debt. One of these reputable economists that the previous gentleman spoke about, Robert Samuelson, has said this spending could trigger an economic and political death spiral. Democrat Erskine Bowles, who headed up the President's Fiscal Responsibility Commission, said the ''debt is like a cancer. It's truly going to destroy the country from within.'' And what do we have, Mr. Chairman? We have the President presenting a new budget that will again double the national debt in 5 years, triple it in 10, add $13 trillion worth of red ink to the Nation's debt. This is after expanding garden-variety government 84 percent in 2 years, nondefense discretionary. Mr. Chairman, you can't spend money you don't have. Massive debts lead to massive tax increases. Massive tax increases lead to no jobs.

The Chairman of the Federal Reserve has said one of the best ways that we can improve jobs today is to put our Nation on a sustainable fiscal course. And I heard the gentleman say that entitlement spending should be on the table. Clearly, the President hasn't gotten the message. It's not what we saw in his budget. We haven't seen it in any other Democrat budget. So it would be wonderful if we saw it. But we don't see it.

I talk to business people in my own district, Mr. Chairman, like Diane Ford of Kaufman, Texas, a small business lady. When she stares in the face of this debt and she sees the tax increase, she writes, ''Congressman, I couldn't hire any more employees. I couldn't expand my business. I would definitely have to close up shop. As a small business owner, I'm afraid of my future.'' Small business people all around the Nation know that massive debt leads to massive tax increases. It leads to no jobs. If we want to create jobs, we have to take care of this debt.

And think about future generations, Mr. Chairman. I heard from one of my other constituents who said, ''I've never felt so embarrassed and ashamed about anything I've done in my life as I do about leaving this mess in the laps of Tyler and Caitlin, my precious grandkids.'' He's talking about the national debt.

To protect future generations, to create jobs today, we've got to quit spending money we don't have. And I want to congratulate the chairman of the Appropriations Committee for his excellent work in turning the corner.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the ranking member of the Interior and Environment Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I have been on the Appropriations Committee for 17 years. Eleven of them were under Republican control, eight under a Republican President. And I'm proud of the investments that we've made in this country during those 17 years. We were stronger, more secure, a more productive economy as a result of those investments.

□ 1430

We've improved the lives of Americans. We've cleaned up our water. We've invested in transportation, our national defense, our education system. That's why we have the strongest economy and why, in fact, we continue to be the very best place on the planet to live, to work, and to provide a better future for our children.

What we are doing in this continuing resolution is targeting those programs that are called ''domestic discretionary.'' They represent about 4½ percent of the entire budget, and they have stayed pretty well even. During the Reagan administration, during the Clinton administration, during the Bush administration, which was when we had the lowest job growth ever, they were at about 7½ percent.

The fact is we are not going to balance our budget by targeting that small amount of the budget. The reality is that, when President Reagan left office, tax receipts were about 18.2 percent. They went up a bit during the Clinton administration when we had the greatest expansion ever and when, in fact, people at the highest rate of income tax pocketed more money after taxes than at any time in American history. Right now, they are at 14.9 percent of GDP.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the problem is not one of not investing enough in our country, but one of the revenue being brought in and its being grossly inadequate. In a historical context, we can prove that to be the case. When revenue goes down that low, our economy shrinks; and it becomes a self-defeating cycle.

Now, in the Interior and the Environment appropriations bill, some of the things we do is take out the program that uses offshore oil revenues for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which protects our Nation's precious lands. We are going to dramatically cut construction and maintenance at our national parks, refuges and forests. We are going to take the money away from the Governors and mayors throughout the country for the plumbing that goes underneath our land, what's called the Clean Water and Safe Drinking Water Revolving Fund. That's money they desperately need to ensure the public's health. We take it for granted. We won't take it for granted anymore if we stop those grants.

This bill will not create a single new job. In fact, we estimate it will cut about 800,000 jobs, both public and private. That's not worthy of this Congress on either side of the aisle to be cutting jobs. What we need to be doing is investing in jobs, investing in education, and making sure that children who have been born in particularly difficult social and economic conditions have access to Head Start.

Don't cut $1 billion out of Head Start. Don't cut kindergarten through 12 education, which is the seed corn of our future. Those aren't investments. Those are arbitrary cuts. That's not what we have been about, and that's not how we enable this country to be as strong and as great as it is.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that when we do our budget analysis that it be done with a scalpel, like a surgeon would approach it, not with a meat ax. We should respect all of the good work that the appropriations committees have done over the years in making this a better country as a result.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the immediate past chairman of the committee, the now chairman emeritus of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. I very much appreciate my colleague, the chairman, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, some of my colleagues say they are shocked at the spending reductions we have proposed here. No one should be surprised. For the past several years, Congress and the administration have been spending like there is no tomorrow.

Since FY '08, we have increased nonsecurity discretionary spending by almost 25 percent. In some areas, it has jumped by nearly a third in 2 years. Those were historic spending increases, and they don't even include the $800 billion that was in the massive failed stimulus package. That was such a huge amount of money that some agencies still have not been able to spend it 2 years later.

Well, my colleagues, tomorrow is here. The bill is coming due; and if we do not find a way to stop spending, we are headed towards fiscal disaster.

This absolutely should surprise no one. Republicans on the Appropriations Committee have been warning for 2 years that we cannot continue spending this way. We tried to stop it, to at least slow it down; but for the past 2 years we have not even been able to get an amendment to change the direction of our spendthrift ways.

So now we are faced with record deficits. The President's budget predicts an all-time high of $1.65 trillion in red ink next year. We have been warned that the Federal debt limit of $14 trillion must be increased. Within a decade, our Federal debt could equal more than 70 percent of our GDP.

Without question, this kind of spending is going to run our Federal budget off a cliff, and it will do more harm to our economy than we've seen from the current terrible recession. At least a third of our national debt is owned by foreign nations and investors. What will they do if we cannot begin to pay it down?

Last year, we paid nearly $415 billion in interest on our national debt. That is more than we spent on any discretionary government program other than defense. That is hundreds of billions of dollars not being spent to create jobs, not being spent to fix our roads, not being spent to secure our Nation; and it will continue to grow at an ever faster rate as long as we keep running up these huge deficits.

The American people told us last November that it is time to stop. They were alarmed enough to raise questions all over the country. They, indeed, at the polls indicated that we needed to find a new direction. They want fiscal sanity. They want us to stop spending now before it is too late. The spending reductions in this package are extremely painful. The cuts will affect programs supported by every Member of this House. When Americans begin to understand what is being reduced, we will all be receiving calls from people who are asking us to change our minds.

We must resist these calls for more spending. We cannot become Europe, where citizens believe that government can do everything. We cannot let the United States become another Greece or another Ireland or another Portugal—faced with fiscal collapse.

We have to make the decision now. These cuts will seem harsh, but we cannot avoid them. We cannot settle for half measures in the hopes that in 5 or 10 years we will stop adding to this terrible Federal debt. This is just the down payment. We need to begin entitlement reform to really solve our fiscal problems, but we must start now and we must start here.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut, Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO, who is the new ranking member on the Health and Human Services Appropriations Subcommittee and who was the former chairman and ranking member on Agriculture.

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in opposition to this continuing resolution.

Mr. Chairman, Americans want us to work together to address their top priority—creating jobs, fostering economic recovery. Unfortunately, the majority's priorities are deeply out of touch with those of the country.

Democrats are committed to reducing the deficit. We believe, as taxpayers do, that we should start by ending tax subsidies and special interest waste. We should be slashing oil companies' subsidies first. We must make programs accountable and end the ones that do not work. We can no longer afford to continue the tax breaks for the top 2 percent of the country. Republicans are in a reckless rush to slash without regard to the impact on our economy, on the businesses which create jobs or on middle class or working families who are being responsible, doing the best for their families and educating for the future.

□ 1440

They are hitting ordinary, hard-working families with children, our young people trying to get an education, and the elderly. That is their starting point.

Under their budget every student in America receiving a Pell Grant, close to 9 million people, will see their aid slashed by almost $850 a year; 1.3 million students will lose their supplemental education opportunity grants and, thus, the ability to pay for college. Their plan cuts more than 200,000 kids out of Head Start, kids who will forever lose the opportunity for an early childhood education. They cut aid to school districts and special education. They will cut 55,000 Head Start teachers and close down 16,000 Head Start classrooms.

As with education, so too with jobs. In the midst of a recession and a tough labor market, training and employment services, proven-to-work programs are cut now by $5 billion. That means 8.4 million job seekers, flesh and blood human beings, could lose access to this aid completely.

In these tough economic times, it's our low-income seniors who are the most vulnerable. This budget eliminates at least 10 million new meals delivered to the homebound elderly, cuts fuel assistance for them as well. It will force seniors to either go hungry or move into nursing homes and others to have to choose whether to eat or to stay warm.

The challenge is not whether we address the deficit and spending or not. The question is where do we start to cut. Do we start with slashing ineffective programs and special interest waste, like $40 billion in oil company subsidies? Or do we start cutting those that help the middle class, our businesses, and working families with children, and seniors?

Our job is to get this budget back to common sense, to create jobs, to get this economy running again for the people of this Nation. This continuing resolution offered by the Republicans will do neither.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Labor-HHS Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG).

Mr. REHBERG. Thank you, Mr. ROGERS.

Members of this body, I have an obligation as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education to tell you the simple truth. We're bleeding cash, piling up liabilities, and trying to postpone the day of reckoning; and as a result, America is in a financial free-fall.

In 4 quick years, Congress made what was a spending problem into a spending crisis. We on this side of the aisle wanted to create jobs; you wasted time on a health care reform bill that did not reform health care. While we wanted to build an economy, you wasted time building government. Unfortunately, many in Washington, D.C., especially on Capitol Hill, are in denial.

My colleagues, it's time to stop pretending that the well of wealth in this country is bottomless. We must address spending now, or it will be worse next year.

Two years ago, the Congress passed a stimulus bill totaling nearly $1 trillion. Unfortunately, now we know it did not stimulate. And we know a lot of money went for programs, not necessarily bad programs, but programs that couldn't stimulate the economy. But the biggest travesty of Washington's stimulus spending spree is not that it was a waste of money; it's that the money has been stolen in plain sight from our children and grandchildren. That is what taxation without representation looks like in the 21st century, and it means our Nation's fiscal mess is not just a math problem. It's a moral problem, and we owe it to our children to have much better leadership.

That's why I stand before you with a savings of $23 billion in the three Departments I have responsibility for. No program is immune from waste. So there are no more sacred cows. No law, regulation, or program is perfect or timeless. If something is not working, we will fix it or eliminate it. In my subcommittee, we want to help people, to help train people, to help educate people; but we've learned repeatedly that simply throwing more and more money at well-intentioned programs does not necessarily work.

Those who want to spend money have the burden of proof; and with the debt crisis we face, that burden is a heavy one. Those seeking funding have to prove that the programs are working. Show us the results. Show us that the benefits outweigh the costs. Show us that government can do a better job with this money than the private sector.

This continuing resolution is a change in direction, away from looking to bigger government solutions to empowering individuals and small businesses to create jobs and grow this economy. Anyone who relies on Federal funding has a patriotic duty to look for ways to get by on less for the sake of our country's future today and tomorrow.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished former chairman and now ranking member of the THUD Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, this continuing resolution clearly endangers the fragile recovery of America's economy. While I have the greatest respect for Chairman LATHAM, he has been saddled with an irrational task of cutting $15.5 billion, a 23 percent cut, from the ''Transportation and Housing'' title of the resolution. I cannot fathom how the new majority, which proclaims to be all about

jobs, could as their first piece of business impose deep cuts upon the very programs that have the greatest potential for creating jobs and that provide the necessary foundation for a strong economic recovery.

Specifically, the continuing resolution cuts funding for the Community Development Block Grants program by more than 60 percent to by far the lowest level since the program was created in 1975 under a Republican President, President Gerald Ford. As a result, over 1,200 cities and towns across all 50 States will be forced to shelve local economic development projects in every one of our districts, and the associated 45,000 jobs will be lost.

In addition, the bill proposes to cut over $7 billion in transportation and infrastructure investments. This includes reductions that force Amtrak to lay off roughly 1,500 employees and will halt work on 76 TIGER grants already announced in 40 States and cancel the associated 25,000 construction jobs.

Finally, as we consider the ongoing housing needs of our most vulnerable citizens, this bill reduces by $760 million, a 75 percent cut, programs serving elderly and disabled persons, handcuffing our ability to keep up with the support required to meet the needs of our expanding and aging senior population.

In addition, the $75 million cut to our Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing, VASH, program is frankly appalling. Just last week, HUD released a report indicating that more than 76,000 veterans are homeless on any given night and that vets are 50 percent more likely to be homeless. Yet the majority's bill turns its back on our homeless vets, leaving them literally out in the cold.

Mr. Chairman, while I'm glad this bill does not meet the Republican majority's pledge to cut $100 billion in non-security spending, it will still have a dramatic negative impact on American families, while making no more than a ripple in the ocean of additional national debt caused by the massive tax cuts adopted during the Bush administration, at the very time that America has engaged in two trillion-dollar wars in the Islamic world.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the Transportation and HUD Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. Chairman, I would just maybe respond a little bit to what the gentleman from Massachusetts just said. The fact of the matter is there will not be a veteran, a homeless vet, that will not get a voucher. The fact of the matter is there are 30,000 vouchers available today. Only 19,000 of those have been used. There are 11,000 vouchers waiting; and the problem basically is with the Department, with HUD and VA, as far as trying to write the rules to actually get these people the vouchers they need.

So any kind of characterization that we're putting vets out in the cold is absolutely untrue. You have your opinion, but the facts speak for themselves.

□ 1450

Now also we are not reducing any such section 8 vouchers. They will remain. No one is going to be put out anywhere. We maintain those programs for those folks, and to characterize it in any way differently simply is not factual.

Mr. DICKS. I yield myself 1 minute.

I would say to the gentleman, here is the problem: There are, I think, about 29,000 of these vouchers out there now. And you are correct; some of them haven't been able to find a place to live yet. Secretary Shinseki, who I talked to personally about this, and Secretary Donovan have said there are 60,000 of these veterans who need this voucher. So there are 30,000 more that we need to do. I was shocked when I saw on the list of terminations that your side decided to terminate this program. I hoped you would reconsider that.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. There are 11,000 vouchers sitting there unused today. There are 19,000 that have been issued. The gentleman knows that we are not cutting those. There are 11,000 still available under this bill. And we are going to review this as we go through for the next fiscal year, 2012.

Mr. DICKS. That is what I was going to ask the gentleman. I would like to work with him on this. So if that's the gentleman's intent, then we will work together and try to get the job done.

Mr. LATHAM. I appreciate that. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), the former chairman and now the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

(Mr. SERRANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SERRANO. The continuing resolution that we are voting on today is irresponsible and extreme. We all recognize that we should take reasonable steps to address our deficit. However, what we are voting on today makes cuts that will harm our students, our public safety, our health, and our environment.

When I served as chair of the Financial Services Subcommittee, I worked hard to make sure that we protected the consumer, the investor, and the taxpayer. The agencies funded by this subcommittee ensure that Americans can have confidence in the products that they use and the security of their investments. The CR that we are considering today, with its cuts to the IRS and the Securities and Exchange Commission, fails to provide sufficient resources to meet these challenges.

IRS funding will be cut by $600 million, and this will have an immediate impact on taxpayer services as we approach the busy tax season. The IRS will be forced to cut as many as 4,100 employees, mainly enforcement agents, and this will harm the ability of the IRS to find tax cheaters. It is important to remember that if we reduce the government's ability to collect taxes, this will actually increase our deficit, since enforcement resources have a $7-to-$1 return on investment.

The Securities and Exchange Commission will see a $41 million reduction from last year, which will prevent it from hiring the staff it needs to carry out the critical new Dodd-Frank financial oversight functions that it has been given. This will mean that hedge funds, credit rating agencies, and broker-dealers will continue to operate without regulation, adding to an increased risk of another fiscal meltdown.

As chair of this subcommittee, I also worked hard to make sure that capital and other assistance went to small businesses and low-income communities. A key part of this was making sure that the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund had the resources it needed to support financial institutions making investments in disadvantaged communities. Under the continuing resolution which we are voting on today, the CDFI Fund will get slashed from $246 million last year to just $50 million this year. This will mean that more than 19,000 jobs will non-materialize, more than 14,000 affordable housing units will not be built, and more than 3,100 small businesses will not be assisted.

I am particularly distressed that the majority party decided to meddle once again in the District of Columbia's local affairs. We should all be able to agree that D.C. should be left alone to decide how to spend its own locally derived funds. One local program that the majority has decided to ban is the syringe exchange program. The science on this is clear: Giving addicts clean needles does nothing to drive up drug use, but it does do wonders to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS. Even if you do not believe the science, you should not meddle in the District of Columbia.

Another impact of the funding resolution we are voting on today will be a weakening of the equitable and efficient administration of justice in the Federal courts. The $476 million cut to the Judiciary will force the federal courts to lay off more than 2,400 support staff and stop payments to the attorneys who represent indigent criminal defendants.

There are numerous other cuts across the range of Agencies that are included in the Financial Service and General Government section—some that would severely impact jobs and others that would negatively affect our election practices. For example, the General Services Administration (GSA) Federal Building Fund will see a cut of $1.7 billion from FY2010, which will result in the elimination of nearly 16,000 private sector construction jobs

and as many as 40,000 janitorial and maintenance jobs. The Election Assistance Commission will see a huge budget drop from $93 million last year to $10 million this year, effectively ending its work to help states improve their election practices and equipment.

So let me conclude by saying that the deficit cutting approach that we are voting on today will not only result in significant harm to America's consumers, investors, taxpayers, workers, businesses in disadvantaged communities, and the security of our elections, but it will also impact education, housing, transportation, health, the environment and all facets of our economic recovery. I would urge my colleagues to vote no.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ALDERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, as many have said here today, our government has a spending problem, and the American people are demanding that we find a solution. This CR that is before the House today is a step towards finding a solution to that problem.

The homeland security title of this CR strikes the right balance between funding priority programs that are essential to our Nation's security and at the same time keeping our discretionary spending in check. This CR provides a total of $41.5 billion in discretionary funding for the Department of Homeland Security. This funding level is $1 billion, or 2.4 percent, below FY 2010 and $2.1 billion, or 4.8 percent, below the President's FY 2011 request.

In contrast to previous annual spending bills, this CR provides funding for the annual costs of disasters from within the existing budget. So rather than relying upon emergency supplementals, the CR responsibly addresses the $1.6 billion shortfall in disaster relief costs that the President has failed to address in the 2011 budget request. Supporting the cost of security demands truth-in-budgeting, and we are delivering where the President and OMB have failed.

Having said that, the Department of Homeland Security is not immune from fiscal discipline. Underperforming programs have been significantly cut in this CR that we are debating today. Let me add, by implementing these cuts, we are not choosing between homeland security and fiscal responsibility. Both are serious national security issues, and they must be dealt with immediately. And through a series of tough choices, this CR achieves both. That is precisely why this CR includes sufficient funding to sustain critical operations in the front-line agencies such as the CBP, Coast Guard, ICE, the TSA, and the Department's Intelligence Office.

Mr. Chair, homeland security is far too important to be subject to budget gimmicks and inadequate justifications. The homeland security title of this CR responsibly funds programs vital to our Nation's security, and it will help them get back on track from our Federal budget perspective.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), who has been the chairman and now the ranking member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, if there ever were a case of overheated campaign rhetoric overtaking responsible governing, then we are seeing that case here today.

Far from continuing to fund the government through to the end of the fiscal year, this measure would dramatically slash the investments in our economic recovery and undermine our national security in the process. I don't know why we even call it a continuing resolution—I guess to avoid a markup in the Appropriations Committee. But it's a brand new appropriations bill, and a very destructive one at that. It's a job-killer of all kinds of jobs but most especially of national security jobs.

Let's talk about firefighters. We rely on our firefighters as our preeminent first responders. They arrive at the scene of all types of emergencies—attempted bombings, security incidents, medical, fire emergencies, all kinds of emergencies. But this bill eliminates the SAFER firefighter staffing program, guaranteeing that thousands of firefighters will lose their jobs this year, according to the Fire Chiefs Association. SAFER has enabled our local communities to avoid firefighter layoffs in tough economic times, to keep their fire departments at full strength. This Republican continuing resolution would just simply remove this protection.

□ 1500

Let's talk about law enforcement, funded in the Commerce-Justice appropriations bill. We rely on our local police officers, not only as first responders, but also as first detectors of homegrown terrorist activity. Yet this bill eliminates the Community Policing grant program, the COPS program, guaranteeing that local governments which are already laying off workers will have to fire between 1,300 and 3,000 police officers.

Now, these job losses could be prevented if we were attempting to govern seriously instead of appeasing the Republican tea party base. The best cure for our budget deficit is a recovered economy, not a bill that slashes and burns government services that are critical to our economic competitiveness and to our public safety.

So I urge a ''no'' vote on this CR. Instead of a continuing resolution, we might say that CR in this case stands for ''Continuing the Recession,'' because that's really what this bill would achieve.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), the chairman of the State, Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Ms. GRANGER. For too long we have seen unsustainable increases in spending. This bill before us today puts an end to that practice 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 our debt.

In the bill before us, we are taking our pledge to cut spending seriously. Since fiscal year 2008, the State, Foreign Operations budget has had dramatic increases. 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 a 21 percent reduction from the President's fiscal year 2011 request, an 8 percent reduction from the fiscal year 2010 enacted level, and an 18 percent 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.

To achieve the level of savings included for the remainder of FY11, reductions were made in areas that, while difficult, preserve important efforts and priorities. For example, the bill before us supports top national security priorities, maintains momentum in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan, and fully funds the U.S.-Israel memorandum of understanding at $3 billion. It 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, many programs are scaled back, and large administrative commitments like climate change are shelved. While these choices were difficult, they must be made in order to preserve our national security priorities.

There is a need for continued oversight in our foreign aid, and for that reason, I've 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 for the last 4 years, and I look forward to continuing to work together. We both agree that Members on both sides of the aisle deserve to be heard on the important foreign policy matters that come before our subcommittee.

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 CHAIR. The Chair would note that the gentleman from Kentucky has 9 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Washington has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, the

former chair of the State, Foreign Operations Subcommittee, now the ranking member, my good friend, NITA LOWEY.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the gentleman, our distinguished chair. It's been a pleasure working with you. And I just want to say to the current chair of our committee, we've always worked in a bipartisan way, and that's why I reluctantly rise in opposition to the State and Foreign Operations budget in the CR. But I look forward to continuing to work together.

These are irresponsible cuts. These cuts would threaten global security and stability. Despite broad agreement that a three-legged stool of defense, diplomacy, and development is vital to our national security, this bill dramatically weakens diplomacy and development.

On a positive note, I'm pleased with the inclusion of $3 billion pursuant to the MOU between the United States and Israel and continued commitments to Egypt and Jordan.

However, especially given the ongoing development in Egypt, through the region, and around the world, the drastic cuts in democratic governance, alternate development options, international financial institutions, conflict mitigation, reconciliation, disaster assistance, and global health, would significantly impede our ability to achieve our security objectives.

I'm really disappointed with the Republican leadership's partisan approach because, as I mentioned, during my 4 years as chair of the subcommittee, I worked closely with my ranking member, and we did not include divisive social issues in our bills. Yet this CR would reinstate the global gag rule and prohibit funds for the United Nations Population Fund, denying millions of women family planning and basic health services.

Finally, while all these measures are brought to the floor under the guise of fiscal responsibility, in my judgment, they endanger our long-term economic security and fail to create jobs. So I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), former chairman of the Republican Conference in the House.

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. I want to thank the distinguished chairman for yielding time and for his leadership on this and so many issues.

After years of runaway Federal spending by both political parties, last year House Republicans took the pledge. We said to the American people, give us another chance to lead this Congress, and the first thing we'll do is we'll reduce domestic spending to pre-bail out, pre-stimulus levels, saving the American people at least $100 billion. And today, simply put, this new majority will keep our word with the American people. And in Washington, D.C., that's saying a lot.

Now we'll consider H.R. 1, which will save at least $100 billion in this fiscal year. It is, in fact, the single largest rescission package in the history of this Congress. With a $14 trillion national debt and a $1.5 trillion deficit this year, cutting $100 billion will not solve our fiscal crisis, but it's a good start, and it's a promise kept. And here in Washington, D.C., that's really saying something.

Now, to save our Nation from an avalanche of debt facing future generations, we must just do a couple of basic things. First, we've got to stop what we've been doing, piling a mountain range of debt on our children and grandchildren. We've got to turn around and we've got to begin to head in the other direction. We have to face our present fiscal crisis squarely and with courage. And today, this new Republican majority will do just that. We'll begin the process of turning our ship of state back toward that horizon of fiscal responsibility and fiscal solvency and sustainability for generations to come.

I urge my colleagues in both political parties, join us in this important first step. Join us in this important promise kept. Work with us, and we will work with you to put our Nation on a pathway toward fiscal solvency and, ultimately, lay a foundation for real economic growth for generations to come.

□ 1510

Mr. DICKS. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Democratic Whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who has been a longtime member of the Appropriations Committee and a very good friend.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would say to the previous speaker, my friend Mr. PENCE, we did that. In 1993 we looked the fiscal posture of our country in the eye. We had sustained $1.4 trillion of deficit spending under Mr. Reagan and $1.1 trillion of deficit spending under Mr. Bush, and we put legislation on this floor and said we need to meet our fiscal responsibilities. Not a single member, unfortunately, of the Republican Party voted for that legislation. But over the next 8 years, we had a net surplus in this country; the only time in the lifetime of anybody in this body that that has happened. We did it working together.

Unfortunately, the last administration ran up $3.8 trillion of deficit, and we inherited an economy that was in substantial free fall. The President said that; Mr. Bernanke said that; Mr. Paulson said that. And so we adopted legislation that tried to stabilize that economy, and the good news is that we have. We haven't gotten to where we want to be. We want to create more jobs. As the President says, we want to invest in growing our economy and bringing jobs back.

There will be some very tough decisions we will have to make moving forward; and, frankly, as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee knows and as the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee knows, you will not get there focused simply on 14 percent of the budget. It will not happen, my friends.

You might want to delude yourself or delude our constituents and say that you can simply cut all 14 percent of non-defense discretionary spending, and you will still have an operating deficit this year if we cut out every nickel of discretionary spending.

That discretionary spending of course educates our children. It promotes our health. It promotes our commerce. It promotes building the economy. That's what this issue is about.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DICKS. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HOYER. So I rise to say to all of us, all 435 of us, it will take courage, cooperation, and common sense to address the deficit situation that confronts us.

And it is a crisis. It must be met. We do not have an alternative. Because if we do not address it—all of you have heard about my three children, my three grandchildren, and my one great granddaughter. All of them will hold me and all of you responsible for the legacy of fiscal irresponsibility which we will leave them.

We now have bipartisan responsibility. You are in charge of this House; the Democrats are in charge of the Senate, and we have a President who is a Democrat. It is a perfect opportunity for us all to take responsibility and, yes, part of the blame, because the decisions we will have to make will be tough; they will be agonizing, and they will be wrenching. And people will say, We're not sure you should have done it.

If we do it together, we can do it. And we owe it to our country, our fellow citizens, and our children to do so.

Cutting spending is part of the solution to our deficit. But we also have to cut wisely, making the distinction between spending we can do without, and investments that are vital to our future growth.

But Republicans have brought to the floor a spending bill full of cuts that are short-sighted and indiscriminate. They endanger the investments we need to grow our economy and create jobs—to out-build, out-innovate, and out-educate our competitors. When we talk about cutting those investments, we are talking about cutting tomorrow's jobs.

I wish that my Republican colleagues would listen to the business leaders who understand the importance of thoughtful investment.

Listen to Tom Donohue of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and Richard Trumka of the AFL–CIO, who don't agree on very much: "Whether it is building roads, bridges, high-speed broadband, energy systems and schools, these projects not only create jobs . . . they are an investment in building the modern infrastructure our country needs to compete."

But the Republican spending bill would cancel 76 transportation projects in 40 States, and leave us with roads, bridges, and an air traffic control system stuck in the last century.

Listen to Marc Benioff, CEO of Salesforce.com: "The number 1 thing the government needs to do is increase research funding."

But the Republican spending bill would cut support for 20,000 researchers at the National Science Foundation, cut $1.4 billion of energy research, and cut $2.5 billion of medical research.

Listen to Bill Gates: "If we don't start innovating in education to make it better and more accessible . . . our competitiveness will fall behind that of other countries."

But the Republican spending bill would kick 200,000 children out of Head Start and make it harder for Americans to afford college.

By all means, let's take real action on the deficit—but not in a way that sacrifices America's competitive edge.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield 2 minutes to a new Member of Congress, a freshman and a new member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from a wonderful place in Arkansas called Rogers, Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chair, I am glad the gentleman a few minutes ago from Virginia talked about the mayors of America and the county judges of America, because just a few weeks ago I was one of those mayors.

Twelve years ago, when I sought that office, I inherited a city that was in terrible deficit spending, that had unreasonable government intrusion into the private sector, that was affecting the economic well-being of that city.

I am pleased to say that, because we took the position of putting our fiscal house in order and because we changed the way government approaches its involvement in the private sector and because we limited the dependency of our city on the Federal Government that we created a city of excellence, that we significantly enhanced the quality of life. We did $1 billion worth of investment; we created thousands of jobs, and Rogers, Arkansas, is the example the American people are looking for today.

I realize that these are difficult times. They are times that are going to require great courage, a sense of duty, and shared sacrifice in order to put America on the right path. I believe in this America, and that's the way forward.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 1⅓ minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), who has now become the ranking member on Agriculture.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, I thank my ranking chair, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

I rise with serious concerns. I am the ranking member of the Agricultural Appropriations Committee. I come from the State that is the leading ag State in the Nation, California, and agriculture is the number one economy in California. We're a State that is really diversified, and we do it without subsidies and we do it by partnerships.

The partnership is essentially a public-private partnership, and there is a major role to be able to make the private sector successful with that partnership.

We all care about feeding people, all people, whether they are rich or poor. One thing they all have in common is that they want that food to be safe. They want the drink to be safe. They want the drugs that they buy in the stores to be safe. And the problem with this CR, which is very interestingly talked about on their side in the generic of the necessity of cutting the deficit, which we all agree on. But to take a meat axe approach to the USDA and the FDA cuts the safety net for food and drugs.

For example, the Food and Safety Inspection Service would have to cut down on their inspectors who have to be in every one of the 6,300 slaughter and processing facilities. If they are not there, there is no work. We would have to close these facilities for months at a time; therefore, putting a lot of people out of work, less jobs, and certainly no food safety.

It goes on and on and on. We need to argue these details, not just the generics.

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE (FSIS)

FSIS is responsible for the safety of domestic and imported meat and poultry. It inspects nearly 6,300 slaughter and processing facilities. Its inspectors are required to be present continuously during the operation of slaughter plants and to inspect every meat and poultry processing plant in the U.S. every day. All imported meat and poultry must also be inspected by FSIS. The Republican proposal would hold funding for FSIS to the 2008 level. The administration estimates that this would require a furlough of all FSIS employees, including all inspectors, for 30-47 working days (which amounts to 20–30 percent of the working days left in the fiscal year assuming enactment on March 4th.) Without inspectors available, meat and poultry plants would be legally required to stop operating. The administration estimates the economic loss from stopping plant operations at $11 billion. It also expects that consumer prices for meat and poultry would rise with the curtailed supply. That's a lot of jobs and food—not only up unemployment but also drive—up prices.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION (FDA)

FDA is responsible for the safety of food, drugs, medical devices, human blood products, vaccines, cosmetics, and many other products. Consumers spend about 20 cents of every dollar on products regulated by FDA. The Republican proposal would fund FDA at about 10 percent below the 2010 level. Coming this late in the fiscal year, much deeper cuts would be necessary to end fiscal year 2011 at the level appropriated in the Republican bill. The administration has estimated that under the Republican proposal there would be 2,000 fewer FDA inspections of firms that manufacture food and medical products; 10,000 fewer FDA import inspections to verify that imported foods and medical products meet safety standards; and analysis of 6,000 fewer food and medical product samples to identify safety problems. In addition, this level will likely lead to furloughs and/or * * *

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman for all the work that he has done in helping to put this continuing resolution together.

This is a giant step forward in stopping the culture of spending that has gone on here in this town for a long time and begins a culture of savings.

In the subcommittee which I have been asked to chair, the Legislative Branch only deals with maybe one-half of 1 percent of all the money that we're talking about, but we didn't think that we ought to be immune to all the pain that goes on as well. In fact, I think, when times are tough, leaders ought to lead. And so we can help save taxpayers dollars by spending less money on ourselves, and that's what we do in this bill.

We cut the accounts of the leadership offices. We cut the accounts of all the Members' offices. We cut the accounts of the committee staff and their offices. In fact, the Appropriations Committee, which Mr. ROGERS chairs, will reduce their spending by 9 percent. So certainly Congress is taking the budget axe to its own spending and leading by example, and I think that's important.

So as we move forward, Mr. Chairman, I think that we can do a whole lot more with a whole lot less around this place. We want to lead by example. That's what we're trying to do, and I think we are taking a giant step forward.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP). He has become the new ranking member on Military Construction and VA.

□ 1520

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

While the Military Construction/VA portion of this bill is not cut as much as some other parts of the continuing resolution, the cumulative effect of this CR is really to hurt our veterans. The bill provides $74.2 billion, which is $2.4 billion below the FY 2010; $1.8 billion below the President's request.

Mr. Chairman, it's time to end the theatrics and get to work. This continuing resolution continues the heated rhetoric. If this bill is signed into law, it will hurt our economic recovery, which in turn will affect our veterans. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, more than 15 percent of Iraq and Afghanistan war veterans are unemployed, far higher than the national jobless rate. If we follow through with some of these disastrous cuts, we'll see that rate go higher as the operations in Iraq and Afghanistan wind down and our troops come home seeking employment.

For example, as the gentleman from North Carolina pointed out, we're cutting aid that local governments use to

hire police officers. Many of our local police officers are veterans and they are hired with the community oriented policing grants. This will be eliminated. If we cut money for firefighters, this cut will have the same effect as cutting money from the cops. Our veterans will have nowhere to go to continue to serve their communities.

We can do better than this bill. We must be serious because we have serious issues. Veterans have paid the price for the freedoms we enjoy in this country, but freedom is not free. It has been paid for with the lives and the limbs of countless men and women who have served this country in uniform. We owe them better than this.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin, a brand new Member of this body, Mr. DUFFY.

(Mr. DUFFY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUFFY. I thank the chairman for yielding time to me to address the issue today with regard to unspent, unobligated stimulus money.

Two years ago, this Congress voted to spend nearly a trillion dollars of stimulus money. They said that we could borrow and spend our way to prosperity. Well, 2 years later we are well aware that borrowing and spending doesn't lead to economic prosperity, growth and sustainable jobs. We know it comes from the private sector—people who invest in their businesses and ideas. And from there, they expand and grow. That's how we create jobs in this great country.

Now we are stuck with a $14 trillion debt. This year, we're going to borrow $1.5 trillion. More borrowing, more spending, is going to lead to job-crushing taxes and passing this debt on to our next generation. It's unacceptable.

I am encouraged that we are working on sending all unobligated stimulus money back to the Fed so we can pay down our debt.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the new ranking member of the Commerce-Science-Justice Subcommittee.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 1¼ minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the gentleman and I thank him for his extraordinary leadership on this critical matter.

The Economic Policy Institute says that the GOP plan will cost our country 800,000 jobs. The parts of the CR that relate to Commerce, Justice and Science relate to essentially four areas.

International trade assistance exports. The President has a major initiative to create American jobs through exporting. They want to cut it by $93 million.

They want to cut $1.3 billion out of law enforcement. So if you need a cop and you call 911, there may or may not be one available because if it's one of the 1,300 that will be cut under this bill, they'll be gone.

In legal services, some 80,000 cases reduced—for seniors who will be fighting mortgage foreclosure that would be fraudulent in their case, or domestic abuse violence in their homes, through cuts to legal services.

And a $150 million cut for the National Science Foundation.

Now my colleagues have a tough job. They're in the majority. They've got to make rational decisions. Let me just say this. If spending was bad, we would eliminate all spending. Some spending is necessary. We should be cutting waste. We should not be cutting law enforcement and legal assistance and scientific analysis, and we shouldn't be cutting export opportunities for American workers. And we shouldn't be risking 800,000 jobs in our country; not today, not on any day.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), the chairman of the Energy and Water Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, some suggested some time ago that we have to wait until 2012 or 2013 to make these decisions. We need to make these tough decisions now, to cut spending and to create a climate where the private sector can go hire workers.

The Energy and Water Development section of this bill totals $29.9 billion, an 11 percent reduction from fiscal year 2010. That's a tough decision. This level more truly represents what should be the top priorities of the Department of Energy, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the other accounts funded under our subcommittee's purview.

Far from the ''meat axe'' approach that some have suggested we're taking in H.R. 1, our product is one of careful, thoughtful, line-by-line analysis. We have looked at which programs are must-haves, which have significant unobligated balances, and which are redundant. Above all, we've ensured that the core national security mandate of the Department is adequately funded. Frankly, other countries' nuclear stockpile programs aren't taking a time-out while we wrestle with our budget challenges. The stewardship of the nuclear stockpile is the foremost responsibility of the Department of Energy. In fact, weapons activities and naval reactors receive the only increases in our bill.

We do, however, make major reductions in the Department of Energy; major cuts. We eliminate all earmarks. That's close to $500 million, just in the Department of Energy. And we cut out programs like weatherization, with billions and billions of unspent stimulus money. In fact, the Department of Energy received close to $39 billion in stimulus money.

Finally, we've cut back on programs like biological and environmental research that are not core to the Department's historical responsibilities and focus. We do all of this so the Department of Energy can focus on what we need to do—to support the private sector in developing the next round of energy-related intellectual property and the jobs associated with it.

We need to do it. I support the CR. I think we ought to move on with it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the life-saving work done by Title X family planning providers across the nation.

In 2009, five million men and women received important preventive services from family planning providers, including 2.3 million breast exams, 2.2 million tests for cervical cancer, and nearly 1 million HIV tests. The proposed cuts in H.R. 1 would eviscerate these services, reducing family planning and cancer prevention services. Cuts to family planning would have devastating consequences to families nationwide.

Why is the Republican leadership attacking proven health care services, instead of working with us to create jobs? This legislation does not move our country forward.

By attacking family planning and pursuing an extreme social agenda, Republicans are dividing our country and distracting from the very real economic problems facing our nation.

While these cuts to family planning were proposed under the auspices of being "fiscally responsible", that is far from the truth.

For every dollar invested in Title X family planning services, taxpayers save just under $4. By preventing cancer, identifying cancer in early stages, and preventing HIV/AIDS, Title X providers are saving money, as well as lives. Cutting family planning is not fiscally responsible, and will not reduce the bottom line.

Moreover, this cut has nothing to do with ending funding for abortions, despite claims to the contrary. Title X family planning funds simply do not fund abortions. If we want to reduce the number of abortions in this country, the methodology is clear—empower women to prevent unintended pregnancies through education and access to contraception. And, that is precisely what family planning funding does.

Nationwide, this cut will impact family planning services for 5 million women and men. In my home state of New York, cuts to Planned Parenthood would impact 209,410 patients. Just last year, Planned Parenthood provided 70,490 screenings for cervical cancer in New York, detecting 7,931 abnormal results requiring medical action. Another 67,957 women received breast exams. 138,501 tests for Chlamydia helped to avert the leading cause of preventable infertility in America today. New Yorkers stand to lose valuable health services.

These statistics represent real women, with real needs. Can we turn our back on them? No, we cannot.

We need to work together to invest in the services that will help our country to be successful. We must focus on building our economy, rather than eliminating health care services.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chair, Americans' top priority is creating jobs. But six weeks into the 112th Congress, the Republican leadership has yet to bring a single, solitary jobs bill to the floor.

Once again, we are here today to exercise one of our primary constitutional responsibilities as members of Congress—to pass appropriations legislation to fund the many basic

and essential programs the federal governments, on which millions of Americans rely. Today is an incredible opportunity, for Republicans and Democrats to work together—to bridge the gap between parties and talking points—and pass a bill that meets our shared goals of creating jobs, building our infrastructure, and strengthening our economy.

Sadly, the Republican leaders have brought to the floor a continuing resolution that jeopardizes American jobs and our economic future by rolling back investments that will help our private sector grow and put people back to work. It thoughtlessly makes extreme cuts to appease an extreme wing of their party, at the expense of the American people.

EDUCATION

Mr. Chair, building an excellent public education system that provides each and every child the opportunity to succeed is the single greatest investment we can make to secure our nation's future—an investment that I have devoted much of my life to support and achieve. From Preschool to K–12 to Higher Education, Republican cuts would undermine our global economic standing by denying opportunity to students, who depend on the government for their education.

As President Obama said in his state of the union address, it's not just about ''how we cut'' but ''what we cut.'' Education is an investment in our future, and we can't sacrifice our future. But Republicans—through this CR—seem willing to sacrifice our future to meet their arbitrary campaign pledge.

They want to drastically reduce quality preschool for poor children with a $1 billion cut in Head Start, which has shown positive results. For K–12 students, Republicans are proposing to dismantle a wide range of essential school supports—literacy programs; teacher improvements; math and science partnerships; arts in education; parent education; counseling; and graduation promotion.

Their proposal would also slash special education services and college preparation. And many more students would be blocked from going to college if the Republicans had their way—with about half a billion dollars less for Pell grants for disadvantaged youth.

Education is how America can reclaim our edge in job creation, in business leadership, in providing a livable wage, and in economic innovation. Destroying this promise by attempting to balance the budget on the backs of poor children and youth is both unwise and unjust.

By cutting to the heart of the learning needs of America's children and youth through these extraordinary and nonsensical measures, Republican lawmakers clearly don't understand the meaning of investing in our future.

ENVIRONMENT

This CR arbitrarily kills jobs, hurts the public health and is a slap in the face of environmental protection. The CR will set our country back decades by curtailing scientific research, simply because Republican's don't like what the science says. It puts our children's health at risk by handcuffing the EPA to police polluters and simply keeps us addicted to foreign oil and discourages clean energy innovations. This is sound bite politics at its worst, the American public needs real solutions and thoughtful policy.

The CR prohibits any funding from being used to carry out the EPA's power plant pollution safeguard rules. These rules are tailored to only the biggest polluting power plants, ensuring average Americans and small business aren't affected by any regulations.

The Clean Air Act guards the most vulnerable Americans—those with asthma and other lung disease, children, older adults, and people with heart disease and diabetes—from the dangers of airborne pollutants, including the threats from growing carbon dioxide pollution. Each year the Act prevents tens of thousands of adverse health effects, including asthma attacks, heart attacks and even premature death. This year alone, the Clean Air Act will save more than 160,000 lives, according to preliminary estimates by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Yet Republicans plan to starve this life-saving agency of its funding based on purely ideological reasons.

IMMIGRATION

The CR would cut all funding for immigrant integration. Republicans claim that they support legal immigration and want to reward immigrants who waited in line and did things the right way. But then they go and cut funding to critical programs that help those legal immigrants become proud American citizens and better integrated into our communities. If Republicans really want to support legal immigrants, they wouldn't cut important programs that emphasize the value of learning English, learning American history and civics, and becoming U.S. citizens. Regardless of what side of the aisle you sit on, these are commonsense programs that we can all support.

It would also cut overseas refugee assistance and admissions and domestic refugee assistance funding. These cuts would severely diminish our country's ability to help refugees across the globe. The victims would be some of the world's most vulnerable people: refugees fleeing religious persecution from Iran, political persecution from Burma, etc. We are the global leader in refugee resettlement. This is a proud American legacy and it makes us a shining beacon for the world. Haphazard cuts like this endanger refugees, but also America.

If Republicans truly claim to be committed to deficit reduction, then why as they cut millions from beneficial programs like head start and LIHEAP, do they continue to increase defense spending? Until Republicans get serious about controlling defense spending—the largest part of the discretionary budget—they will never achieve their goals of reducing our deficit.

LOCAL/US 36

Mr. Chair, at the state and local level, my home state of Colorado is getting slapped in the face by this CR.

A year ago, US 36—the highway that connects Boulder to Denver—was awarded a $10 Million TIGER/TIFIA Challenge Grant through the recovery Act—to expand one of the most used and heavily congested highways in the state, creating jobs and fostering economic development. The $10 million federal investment helps leverage the additional funds in the area, creating $276 million in employment income and 7,200 jobs. The project impacts 191,000 corridor employees—10% of the state's employment.

To date, only $900k has been obligated, and because the Republican CR rescinds all 'unobligated' ARRA funding across the board without thought to details or individual projects—the many state, regional, and local transportation groups that have invested in the project will never see the remaining $9.1 million they were promised.

For the businesses and residents in my district—this is a slap in the face.

Colorado's US 36 Corridor project won the TIGER Award because it was one of the most innovative projects in the country. Mr. Chair, Rome wasn't built in a day and we can all agree that we should not be punishing innovation.

Mr. Chair, the President's budget release yesterday is an excellent example of cutting back in nearly every aspect of the federal government, while investing in the future. We must tighten our belts and make hard choices and tough changes. But we cannot do so at the expense of growth and innovation.

With cuts like these, Republican leadership has made it very clear that they're not interested in helping families to get ahead in this economy. Instead, they're holding our economic recovery and global competitiveness hostage in an attempt to meet an arbitrary spending goal, to appease the fringe of their party—the same people who advocate for cutting the Department of Education and privatizing social security.

The Republican's continuing resolution before us today is sound bite politics at its worst. The American Public need and deserve real solutions and thoughtful policy. We can and must do better. I encourage my colleagues to oppose the rule for this CR as well as the underlying CR to prevent the irresponsible impact of this Republican spending bill.

Mr. Conyers, the Majority introduced H.R. 1, the ''Full Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011,'' which will make immediate and drastic cuts to the federal budget.

These mindless proposed cuts will hurt jobs, undermine public safety and law enforcement, and restrict fundamental civil liberties.

Below is an itemization of some of the funding decreases to areas of the federal budget that are within the Judiciary Committee's purview—the dollar references being the amounts less than the Administration's requested 2011 budget.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES (COPS)

Funding Decrease: $600 Million/Complete Elimination of Hiring Program

COPS has funded the hiring of more than 122,000 state and local police officers and sheriff's deputies in communities across America. The Republican funding cut means that 3,000 fewer officers will be hired or rehired to be on the streets of our neighborhoods.

FBI

Funding Decrease: $74 Million

The Republican funding cut will delay construction of badly needed training facilities at the FBI Academy in Quantico. This will impact the FBI's effort to update and strengthen training for agents and intelligence analysts to maintain the fight against terrorism, sexual exploitation of children, drugs and other major threats to the U.S. from foreign and domestic sources.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT, VICTIMS OF CRIME ACT, AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND SERVICES ACT (VAWA)

Funding Decrease: $26.5 Million

VAWA programs support victims of domestic and sexual violence. It also has saved $14.8 billion in its first 6 years. If the Republican funding cut tracks FY 2008 levels, VAWA

programs would lose an estimated $170 million. Any cuts to these critical programs would undermine law enforcement and victim protection services.

GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

Funding Decrease: $111.3 Million

DOD's principal divisions, including the Civil Rights Division, the Antitrust Division, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and Civil Division are funded under the category of general legal activities.

The Civil Rights Division, which was chronically underfunded by the Bush Administration, will have to play a critical role with respect to how states and localities redraw their district lines following the decennial Census. As required under section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, the Department of Justice will have to ''pre-clear'' all voting changes. The Civil Rights Division is expecting more than 800 submissions this year and next.

The Republican budget cut will generally undermine the ability of these divisions to protect the civil rights and interests of all Americans.

VARIOUS STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Funding Decrease: $525 Million

These reductions eliminate or essentially gut proven crime prevention and crime reduction programs that localities have used to keep crime rates down. The inevitable result of these cuts will be increased crime and victimizations, more unemployment and more resulting expenditures than these cuts save in federal, state and local law enforcement activities, imprisonments and other costs.

NATIONAL DRUG INTELLIGENCE CENTER

Funding Decrease: $10.6 Million

The Center plays a major role in the fight against international and national illegal drug proliferation. The Republican funding cut will force the Center to furlough valuable employees, which will harm the Center's ability to fight the war on illegal drugs.

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS, JUVENILE JUSTICE PROGRAMS

Funding Decrease: $191,095,000

The JJP strengthens community safety and reduces victimization by setting standards and performance measures for the nation's juvenile justice systems, supporting delinquency prevention and early intervention, and contributing to the prevention and reduction of youth crime and violence.

The inevitable result of the proposed Republican cut to BP funding will be increased crime and victimization; greater substance abuse; exacerbated mental health conditions; increased unemployment and incarceration; and a net increase in long-term costs to federal, state, and local governments.

LAW ENFORCEMENT WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS

Funding Decrease: $71.6 Million

This program provides critical support to law enforcement officers and agents in major metropolitan areas across the Nation in responding to terrorist attacks or other catastrophic incidents. The Republican funding cut will reduce by more than half the money used by the program to eliminate interoperability issues with wireless communications, thereby jeopardizing officer and public safety and the safety of millions of Americans.

U.S. MARSHALS SERVICE (USMS)

Funding Decrease: $9.7 Million

The USMS is responsible for protecting judges which is critically important in light of recent threats to federal judges. The USMS also secures courthouse detention facilities that hold defendants accused of drug, gun and immigration crimes. The Republican funding cut will delay and possibly eliminate over $100 million in needed upgrades in security and construction of courthouse detention areas and facilities, the impact of which will be most acutely felt on the Southwest Border.

FEDERAL JUDICIARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES; DEFENDER SERVICES

Funding Decrease: $613 Million

The Republican cut will force the federal courts to lay off more than 2,400 support staff and to stop payments to attorneys who represent indigent criminal defendants, which may raise constitutional concerns about the availability of adequate criminal defense services. These cuts undermine public safety and the effective administration of justice at a time when criminal caseloads and the workloads of probation and pretrial services offices have reached an all-time high.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY (DHS) AND DEPARTMENT OF STATE

H.R. 1 makes huge cuts in funding to DHS. Around $160 million are cut from accounts that are used to protect our Nation's borders and to facilitate legitimate trade and travel that are vital to our country and its recovering economy.

DHS: CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION—BORDER SECURITY FENCING, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND TECHNOLOGY

Funding Decrease: $124.2 Million

The $124.2 million cut from Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology will jeopardize the Administration's plan to increase the use of technologies that have proven effective at securing our border. Such technologies include mobile surveillance units, thermal imaging devices, mobile radios, and the like. Tens of millions of dollars of cuts to Customs and Facilities Management will inhibit our ability to build needed Border Patrol stations and forward operating bases, and to modernize our severely outdated land ports of entry.

DHS: OFFICE OF CITIZENSHIP, U.S. CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES

Funding Decrease: Complete de-funding

H.R. 1 eliminates all funding for the Office of Citizenship within U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. De-funding the Office and the President's Integration Initiative means that no grants will be available for programs that fund state agencies and non-governmental organizations to help prepare lawful permanent residents to apply for and obtain citizenship. This will increase the burden on cash-strapped state and local governments and decrease the provision of civics-based English language classes that help aspiring citizens integrate into their communities. The President's budget request in Fiscal Year 2011 was only $18 million. This small investment has a big payoff: it assists immigrants to become proud, new American citizens who have studied English and the fundamentals of our government and who understand the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. The President's proposed budget for Fiscal Year 2012 increases this investment to $20 million. The President is heading in the right direction of working to integrate immigrants into our country. The Republican CR takes us in the wrong directly entirely.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE: MIGRATION AND REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

Funding Decrease: $582 Million

H.R. 1 cuts one-third of the funds for the State Department's Migration and Refugee Assistance program, which is used to protect refugees overseas and to admit refugees to the United States. This irresponsible and severe cut may seriously jeopardize our ability to protect the world's most vulnerable people-people fleeing persecution and torture. The cut will diminish our ability to support the critical work of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the International Committee of the Red Cross, who provide on-the-ground protection to refugees fleeing persecution. A cut like this could increase the risk of sexual violence for refugee women in camps. This cut also may jeopardize our ability to meet the President's goal of resettling 80,000 refugees in the U.S. this fiscal year. We are the global leader in refugee resettlement. This is a proud American legacy and it makes us a shining beacon for the world. Haphazard cuts like this endanger refugees, but also America.

OTHER AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION (LSC)

Funding Decrease: $85 Million

LSC provides grants to support access to justice to our fellow Americans in need. The Republican cut would reduce LSC's funding by nearly 20%, which will result in a layoff of at least 370 staff attorneys in local programs, closure of many rural offices, and less civil access to justice for 161,000 Americans who will go without the services of an attorney. This includes women seeking safety for themselves and their children from domestic violence, veterans returning to civilian life without a job, and senior citizens trying to save their homes from foreclosure.

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES (ACUS)

Funding Decrease: $1.7 Million

ACUS is a recently established independent agency designed to save millions in taxpayer dollars by recommending ways to improve and streamline the regulatory and rulemaking process. Even though Republicans claim they support the same goals, the Republican funding cut will gut ACUS. It will cut ACUS's funding by 53%, which will result in freezing all research grants and causing staff cuts and furloughs.

UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE (USPTO)

Funding Decrease: $400 Million

The USPTO examines and approves applications for patents on claimed inventions and administers the registration of trademarks. It also aids in the protection of American intellectual property internationally. The USPTO is fully funded by user fees paid by customers.

The Republican funding plan limits USPTO to 2010 user fee projected levels, which will deprive the overburdened patent office of approximately $200 million it collects in fees, and

an additional $200 million from a fee surcharge and supplemental amount in the 2011 budget.

This will exacerbate the over 700,000 application backlog the USPTO currently faces, prevent needed upgrades in technology to insure quality patents, and freeze hiring of additional examiners. Many of the improvements recently initiated to increase efficiency and decrease backlog will have to be abandoned. Of the 700,000 patents pending, many are in the health related field or involve technological advancement.

The proposed cut will stymie private sector patent reliant industries, undercut job growth and creation and further delay the development of potentially life-saving pharmaceuticals, as well as other technological improvements.

PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD

Funding Decrease: $1.6 Million

Established on the recommendation of the 9/11 Commission, the purpose of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board is to establish a watchdog group within the Executive Office of the President to help maintain an appropriate balance between national security and civil liberties.

PERIODIC CENSUS AND PROGRAMS

Funding Decrease: $72.9 Million

The Census Bureau is in the process of completing the decennial census as required by the Constitution. The results of the census will be used to enforce the requirements of the Voting Rights Act and the constitutional doctrine of "one person, one vote." Curtailing the work of the Census at this moment would be injurious to the protection of the right to vote.

ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION AND FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

Funding Decrease: $6 Million

These commissions safeguard the election process, promote transparency, fight corruption, and protect our citizen's right to vote. The Republican budget cut undermines this critical process and fundamental right.

FAMILY PLANNING TITLE X

Funding Decrease: $317 Million

Title X is the nation's cornerstone family-planning program for low-income women. Currently, this program receives $317 million. H.R. 1 would eliminate all funding for this essential program.

RESTRICTIVE PROVISIONS

REINSTATEMENT OF GLOBAL GAG RULE

H.R. 1 would reinstate the global gag rule that bars USAID funds from overseas health centers unless they agreed not to use their own, non-U.S. funds for abortion services. President Obama repealed this harmful Bush-era policy during his first week in office, after eight years during which thousands of women and families in need of public-health services were turned away from underfunded clinics.

H.R. 1 also contains various restrictive riders, including:

1. a restriction on court review of regulations intended to protect endangered grey wolves
2. a restriction on the Environmental Protection Agency's ability to regulate greenhouse gases and clean water
3. a restriction that forbids the transfer of Guantanamo Bay detainees to the United States for prosecution

This substantial list gives an idea of the broad-ranging adverse impact that these Republican cuts would impose on job growth, public health and safety, and basic American values that we should all hold dear. I hope that we can take a more sensible approach to the budget than the draconian and ill-conceived cuts contained in H.R. 1.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those received for printing in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose dated at least 1 day before the day of consideration of the amendment (but no later than February 15, 2011) and pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate.

Each amendment so received may be offered only by the Member who submitted it for printing or a designee and shall be considered as read if printed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Division A—Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2011
Division B—Full-Year Continuing Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2011
Division C—Stimulus Rescissions
Division D—Miscellaneous Provisions.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Except as expressly provided otherwise, any reference to "this Act" contained in division A of this Act shall be treated as referring only to the provisions of that division.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, Chairman ROGERS deserves an awful lot of credit for having been able to put together this H.R. 1, that saves $100 billion over what many expected we would spend this year. The largest part of this bill is the defense part. The defense part of this bill is not a CR. It is not a continuing resolution. It is an actual, honest-to-God appropriations bill, one that under the leadership of Chairman DICKS during last year we put together; the subcommittee worked hard, many hearings, a really good bill. We worked with our Senate counterparts and we had agreement on this bill.

□ 1530

We had agreement on this bill from the Defense Department, and we were just really disappointed that here we are 5 months into the fiscal year and we are just now getting this bill to the floor. It is no fault of Chairman DICKS. He worked hard, and I know the pressures that he tried to apply and that I tried to apply to get permission to put this bill on the floor. But, anyway, here it is and we have it today.

It is a good defense bill. It is $516 billion. It is a lot of money; but our warfighters, they need training, they need salaries, they need pay, they need medical care, they need weapons, they need equipment, they need technology; and this bill, for the most part, provides that.

The $516 billion is $14.8 billion less than was requested for this fiscal year. That $14.8 billion didn't come about easily. We saved that by going line by line the best that we could in the time that we had to find program changes, to find budget changes, to find slush funds that we didn't think were necessary, and a lot of other ways that we saved the $14.8 billion. But we have a good bill here, and I am hopeful that the House will support this today.

One thing that is different from the bill that we thought we were going to have on the floor is 1,200 earmarks aren't there any more. We took out the earmarks, nearly $3 billion worth of earmarks.

So we have a very clean Defense bill here for you today. I know that there are many who would like to have more, and there are more things we could do. We could reach out into the future, but the world we live in today shows a growing deficit, and it is important that we are willing to contribute to solving it. It is crucial to the future of this Nation that we solve this deficit problem, because if we don't, I hate to think what might happen to our economy, what might happen to our currency, what might happen to our standing in the economy of the world.

I would ask the Members, if this bill came on the floor during Jack Murtha's chairmanship, we would have probably passed this bill in about 10 minutes. That is the way that he did business when he was in the majority. We didn't quite do that. We have an open rule. We have an open rule here that anybody can offer an amendment that is germane to the bill. If it makes it better, fine, we will agree to it. If it doesn't make it better, we will not agree to it. We understand that there are some that will be subject to a point of order, and we will raise those points of order, but we will allow the Member that offers the amendment to discuss it before we raise the point of order as a courtesy to them.

Anyway, again, I want to congratulate Mr. DICKS for the work that he did during the time that he was chairman. As he said in the general debate, he and I have worked together for over 30 years on the national security and intelligence affairs of our Nation. He is very honorable, a very hardworking individual, very much determined to do a good job for our Nation; and he shares the same feeling that I have here that while we may have to make reductions and have to come up with savings, we will not approve anything that has an adverse effect on the warfighter. We

will not do anything that has an adverse effect on the readiness of our national security effort.

It is a commitment that I made many years ago and that Mr. DICKS made many years ago. When we made these cuts we did not affect the warfighter. We didn't cut his pay. One of the largest portions of our Defense bill is military personnel, the cost of salaries. We did not cut that. We didn't get into that at all.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, for military functions administered by the Department of Defense and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty, (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $41,042,653,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $25,912,449,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $13,210,161,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $27,105,755,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10302, and 3038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $4,333,165,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Navy Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,940,191,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Marine Corps platoon leaders class, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $612,191,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10305, and 8038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,650,797,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under section 10211, 10302, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $7,511,296,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air National Guard on duty under section 10211, 10305, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $3,060,098,000.

TITLE II

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Army, as authorized by law; and not to exceed $12,478,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, $33,306,117,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Navy and the Marine Corps, as authorized by law; and not to exceed $14,804,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, $37,809,239,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, $5,539,740,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Air Force, as authorized by law; and not to exceed $7,699,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Air Force, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, $36,062,989,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as authorized by law, $30,210,810,000: *Provided*, That not more than $50,000,000 may be used for the Combatant Commander Initiative Fund authorized under section 166a of title 10, United States Code: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $36,000,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not less than $31,659,000 shall be made available for the Procurement Technical Assistance Cooperative Agreement Program, of which not less than $3,600,000 shall be available for centers defined in 10 U.S.C. 2411(1)(D): *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to plan or implement the consolidation of a budget or

appropriations liaison office of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the office of the Secretary of a military department, or the service headquarters of one of the Armed Forces into a legislative affairs or legislative liaison office: *Provided further*, That $8,251,000, to remain available until expended, is available only for expenses relating to certain classified activities, and may be transferred as necessary by the Secretary of Defense to operation and maintenance appropriations or research, development, test and evaluation appropriations, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That any ceiling on the investment item unit cost of items that may be purchased with operation and maintenance funds shall not apply to the funds described in the preceding proviso: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 370 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $18,750,000)''.

Page 359, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $18,750,000)''.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the chairman. I just want to say a few words about the process here.

It is refreshing to so many of us to come to the House with an open rule. There are some Members who have been part of this body for 4 years now and have not been allowed the opportunity to offer one amendment on the floor because of the absence of open rules. So we are going to have a number of amendments offered here, and this is just a great process.

I also want to commend the Appropriations Committee for the hard work that it took to get the level of savings that we are in the legislation and what a positive step, as was mentioned, it was to cut out the earmarks. There are no earmarks in this bill. That is a wonderful thing. We can actually talk more about the substance and less about just pet projects on the side.

This amendment would reduce by $18.57 million the operations and maintenance defense-wide account. It would send the money to the spending reduction account. We are often told that when we offer amendments like this on the floor, it is not going to save any money. This one does. The money that is saved here will go to the spending reduction account.

Last August, Secretary Gates ordered a review of all outside boards and commissions that provide advice and studies to the Defense Department with an eye toward eliminating unnecessary entities and cutting funding for the studies that they produce by 25 percent.

According to CRS, the Department of Defense funds 65 boards and commissions at a cost of about $75 million. This amendment would achieve the approximate savings that Secretary Gates sought for FY 2011 that would equal $18.75 million. That is 25 percent of the $75 million over time. I certainly don't have any problems with the various panels from which the Defense Department seeks counsel, but I am sure there is some waste there. That is why Secretary Gates has targeted a 25 percent reduction.

I realize the amount of savings in this amendment is relatively small compared to the overall defense budget, but I think the point has to be made here that the defense budget is not sacrosanct. We can't say if it is defense, it is all good; that there is no waste here, we can't cut any. So it is important to look for ways we can actually save.

In fiscal year 2010, more than $1 trillion was spent on discretionary spending. The Department of Defense received more than $508 billion of that. Certainly in a Federal agency that requires the largest budget, this is the Federal agency that has the largest budget, there is going to be some waste and inefficiencies.

□ 1540

This is a great place to start. This is a proposal that came from the Defense Secretary himself, one that wasn't included in the underlying bill, and one that will be addressed in the FY 2012 budget, according the documents released yesterday. In fact, according to the Defense Department, it intends to achieve a savings of more than a billion dollars in FY 2012 simply by eliminating internally produced reports and reducing funding for the types of studies that I'm talking about here.

I applaud the Department's willingness to talk about cuts in its own budget. I urge my colleagues to adopt the same willingness here. If the Defense Department is willing to find savings, we ought to be able to do that here as well. We need to reduce this account which funds boards and commissions and the studies they produce by $18.75 million.

Again, passing this amendment will reduce funding that will not impact the warfighter. It won't impact the war in Afghanistan or the war still going on in Iraq. This would simply signal that this body is willing to cut where we can cut without affecting the necessary protections that we have in the Department of Defense.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mainly, what I'm opposed to is the fact we're not sure what boards or commissions this amendment would deal with. I think it's probably a good idea, but I think the subcommittee will really like to have an opportunity to investigate whether or not a board is necessary or is doing some positive function for the Department of Defense. We'd like to have time to look into that.

We agree with the gentleman that we should find all the savings, all the waste we can, and we did. We reduced the request for this year by the $14.8 billion. I think we did a pretty good job.

On the gentleman's comment about the process, I had the privilege of serving as chairman of this Appropriations Committee for 6 years. I never brought an appropriations bill to the floor under a closed rule. It was 6 years that any germane amendment could be offered.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. I, first of all, want to thank the gentleman for his very kind comments earlier.

This amendment cuts $18.75 million from operations and maintenance Defense-wide to reduce boards and commissions. Well, I think things like the Defense Science Board are very important. We have a number of commissions that are looking into acquisition reform that are trying to help us save money, help us get our acquisition straightened out.

So I agree with the gentleman. I think we should strongly oppose this amendment, and I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for his comments. Like I said, the subcommittee would really like an opportunity to really review this to make sure that we don't make a mistake and cut something that is important.

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. LEE. I rise today in support of the bipartisan Flake amendment, No. 370, to cut $18.75 million from the Defense-wide operations and maintenance budget at the Pentagon.

In my opinion, any discussion about getting our fiscal house in order must begin with a real discussion about reducing the bloated size of the Pentagon budget and ending the war in Afghanistan. And if we are really serious about reducing the deficit, we should be cutting Defense to the 2008 levels rather than cutting domestic discretionary spending to 2008 levels.

We're talking about a $750 billion budget. But the Republican continuing resolution fails to cut the Pentagon budget, and it really increases it by more than $8 billion this year. This will put families and teachers and cops and children out on the street. These cuts will not come close to ending the deficit, will only hurt our economy, won't create any jobs, and given the fact that our economy is on the verge of recovery, we should be doing everything in our power to create jobs. A

nearly $700 million cut to food for women, infants, and children during the height of a recession is really heartless and cold. This cut will not balance the budget and it will certainly not magically reduce the number of hungry children and families across the country.

Republicans want to cut billions of dollars in education programs that impact students at every level, from preschool to graduate school, starting with $1.1 billion in terms of a cut for Head Start. That's going to hurt millions of needy preschoolers. Gutting the Federal Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants by $757 million will really end the dreams of needy college students to be first in their families to earn a college or university degree. Republicans are willing to risk the futures of millions of needy students.

Republican cuts to cost-effective and critical programs like Community Health Centers are a prime example of what is really wrong with this one-sided approach to the budget. Smart investments in improving access to primary care and preventive health services, especially through low-cost programs like the Community Health Centers, are the most effective way to reduce the long-term costs of health care in our country and to reduce the deficit. Republican attempts to cut support for maternal and child health, $50 million; family planning, $317 million; State funds for Health Access Grants, $75 million, worsens the health of children and families, increases the rates of chronic diseases, and does nothing to reduce the deficit.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, we see these budgets come to us each and every day, and we know the impact of what these cuts will do to the majority of Americans who are just struggling to survive through this downturn. We're in the middle of a housing crisis, and we are struggling to correct this. We're seeing unprecedented demand for housing assistance and a near standstill in private construction of affordable housing. Republicans somehow believe that this would be a good time to make massive cuts to rental assistance that keeps countless families from suffering homelessness. They want to dramatically cut Community Development Funds and the Public Housing Capital Fund, which invests Federal dollars in creating desperately needed new affordable housing.

Worse, these cuts will do nothing to create jobs or jump-start the economy. They are the wrong prescription for what ails our country, and we need to go back to the drawing board. The Flake amendment will cut over $18 million from Defense, which is an excellent beginning, but only a beginning.

So, in closing, let me just remind our friends on the other side of the aisle that budgets really are moral documents. They reflect our values and who we are as Americans. Proposing these deep and painful cuts reflects an unfortunate reality that we are putting bombs and missiles and wasteful Pentagon spending first rather than creating jobs for people who deserve to live the American Dream.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. POMPEO. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me just say it was asked which boards and commissions are there which this would cut. There are some 65 boards and commissions. Some are blue ribbon panels. The biggest three are the Defense Policy Board, the Defense Science Board, and the Defense Business Board.

But let me say, again, what this amendment does is simply moves forward what the Secretary of Defense has already identified as savings that he would like to achieve. He has said that they want to cut 25 percent of the budget for these boards and commissions.

The Secretary put this report out in August of last year, so it seems that he intended this for the FY 2011 cycle. That's what we're in right now. We're simply doing what, in my view, the Secretary of Defense has asked us to do or what he is going to carry through.

If we can't do this on Defense or on other wasteful spending, where can we do it? This is a great place to start. We should get this done now because it's going to be tackled later on. Why not get a head start and do it in the FY 2011 budget. If we're trying to realize the savings that we're trying to realize, let's take these boards and commissions that the Secretary of Defense has already said we should cut by 25 percent and give them what he asked for.

□ 1550

Mr. POMPEO. Reclaiming my time, it is the case that Mr. FLAKE's amendment addresses a very important issue, and that's duplicative processes and duplicative agencies. As a former soldier, there is nothing I care more about than making sure we take care of our airmen, our sailors, our marines. I think it is a great place to start to make sure we do just that by eliminating this from the Department of Defense appropriations bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HONDA. I rise in support of this amendment. I am opposed to this continuing resolution and to the Republicans' ''no jobs'' agenda.

Mr. Chairman, the American people want a recovery that supports jobs. Republicans have controlled the House for 41 days and have brought up zero bills to create jobs. These mindless cuts mean 1 million job cuts: no jobs for nurses, no jobs for teachers, no jobs for police, no jobs for firefighters, no jobs for manufacturing, and no jobs for small businesses.

Even worse than what the Republicans are doing to American workers is what they are doing to America's children. This bill will cut funding for education programs by over $10 billion, or 16 percent, which is the largest education cut in history.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA, State grants will be slashed by $557 million, shifting to States and local districts the costs of educating 324,000 students with disabilities, therefore increasing local tax burdens and killing over 7,000 education jobs.

Pell Grants. Pell Grants will be cut by $5.6 billion, making it more difficult for low- and middle-income families to pay for college. These cuts would eliminate or reduce aid for almost 1.5 million students.

Head Start. Head Start would be cut by over $1 billion, leading to the elimination of enrollment slots for 127,000 poor children and the potential loss of over 14,000 jobs.

No one who votes for this bill could ever have the audacity to say they care about our children.

Republicans are wearing their hearts on their sleeves a day after Valentine's Day, but they don't care about children. They don't care about working middle class families, and they don't care to follow the rules of the road. Instead, Republicans want to make you pay. They want to make you pay for Big Oil's $1 billion subsidies, make you pay for higher drug prices, make you pay taxes to start your small business, make you pay for CEO salaries, and make you and your children go it alone.

So, Mr. Chairman, in closing, I oppose this bill. Republicans want you to keep paying for their war and tax cuts for the ultra-rich while they cut jobs, services, and schools. This is not fiscal discipline. This is fiscal insanity.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I rise in support of the amendment that Mr. FLAKE has proposed, and I rise in strong opposition to the underlying CR.

Mr. Chairman, the consequence of this whole discussion about dealing with the deficit and the budget reduction that is being recommended by the Republicans is going to be jobs. If you look at what is being proposed, the other side has had nearly 2 months but has brought zero bills that create jobs. These cuts amount to 1 million jobs that will be lost.

There will be no jobs for nurses. $51 million will be cut from the National Park Service; that is a loss of jobs. $256

million will be cut from State and Federal law enforcement; that is the local police that will be cut. $889 million will be cut from renewable energy programs; those are jobs creating solar panels and outfitting and retrofitting homes so they will be energy-efficient. $1 billion will be cut from the National Institutes of Health, which will be a loss of jobs in research and in providing direct public health care to the American citizens. $1.3 billion will be cut from community health centers; that means no jobs and increased costs in the emergency rooms, where people with very acute illnesses will be—people who will not be able to find health care because they will have nowhere else to go. There will be cuts in rural development—a loss of jobs. There will be a $1.6 billion cut for the Environmental Protection Agency—a loss of jobs. There will be a $96 million cut for substance abuse and mental health services—a loss of jobs.

One of the realities is that we must invest. It has been said over and over again that the point of dealing with this deficit that we have in this country has to be a pragmatic, measured process. It has taken us 10 years to get into the hole that we are in, and we need to plan to get out of that with the same amount of time, if not more.

We also need to talk about revenue generation. We are not going to cut our way out of this deficit, and you are certainly not going to cut your way out of this deficit when you are only concentrating on 14 or 15 percent of the Federal budget, which is why I support this amendment as it is an attempt to deal with defense.

We must create revenues. We must quit giving huge subsidies to Big Oil and Big Gas. We must ask mining companies, for once, to begin to pay royalties on the extractions provided them by the public lands. We must close the corporate loopholes that exist that created the financial collapse of housing in this country, and we must ask Wall Street to pay its fair share through a transaction fee, which will generate billions and billions of dollars for the taxpayers of this country.

In order to deal with this deficit, there must be a corresponding generation of revenue so we can continue to invest in the things that are important to the American people: their families, their lives, their education, their health care, their futures. That is an investment, and with additional revenue we will be able to begin to cut the deficit.

The continuing resolution is not an effort to deal with the deficit. It is a calculation to deal with programs and projects that have helped the middle class succeed, poor people survive, the disabled endure. They are programs and projects that have made this country stronger with their support for education and health care.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote against the continuing resolution.

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FUDGE. I rise to support Mr. FLAKE's amendment because saving $18 million from defense is a great start; but I do, indeed, oppose the underlying Republican continuing resolution.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution threatens jobs, American innovation, and jeopardizes investments that will rebuild America.

As a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, I believe that innovation will lead our Nation and our economy forward. We all know that basic research and technology development create jobs and will help America to win the future. The Republicans have this thing backwards. They have proposed cutting $2.5 billion to fund the National Institutes of Health. This $2.5 billion to NIH funding will be devastating to the biomedical industry that serves as the backbone of Cleveland and so many other communities across the country.

The innovative ways that scientists are pursuing solutions to human suffering with neuroimaging, genomics, and the development of novel treatments that arise from basic findings will improve life for all of us. Innovation will cut down on the costs of these illnesses, lost productivity in the workplace, and it will create important avenues for new investigations that will create new jobs, new ventures, and new industries.

We must continue to make investments in America. Our future is in innovation and technology development, and these cuts are not something we can afford. The loss of funding also means the loss of jobs.

Where are the jobs?

According to a new analysis by the nonpartisan Economic Policy Institute, the Republican CR will cost more than 800,000 private and public jobs. Republicans have controlled the House for 41 days, nearly 2 months, and have brought up zero bills to create jobs. Republicans want to cut Social Security and Medicare. When Republicans say they're cutting costs, they mean cutting Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid until they don't exist.

The American people want leadership that will create jobs and jump-start our Nation's economy. This careless resolution cuts jobs and damages the economy.

Again, I do support the amendment by Mr. FLAKE, but the Republican CR is bad for the American economy, and it is bad for Americans. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Republican CR and help put Americans back to work.

□ 1600

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. I too rise in support of Mr. FLAKE's amendment. I see it as a small beginning, a very small beginning, to cutting wasteful Pentagon spending. But Mr. Chair, this entire continuing resolution is bad for the economy and bad for this country. It's all a part of the Republican no jobs for America agenda.

The majority has no interest in doing anything whatsoever to help the 9 percent of Americans who are out of work. They've controlled the House for just about 6 weeks, and they've not brought up a single bill that would create a single job. They've brought up a bill that would continue to shred our civil liberties. They've brought up a bill that will infuse our campaigns with even more corrupting special interest money. They've brought up a bill that would take away guaranteed affordable health care. But nothing to address persistent joblessness. Nothing at all to fix the devastating recession that they caused in the first place.

Their mindless cuts don't do anything to strengthen America. They're not cutting spending; they're cutting jobs. Their agenda means cutting jobs for nurses, cutting jobs for teachers, police officers, small businesses, the very people who form the backbone of the middle class of the United States of America. The Speaker of the House himself said this morning that if some jobs are lost as a result of their cuts, ''so be it.'' He might as well have added, ''Let them eat cake.''

The best way to reduce the deficit is to put Americans back to work, Mr. Chairman, but the Republicans' no-jobs plan is all about cutting the very spending that sustains middle class families. When they say they want to cut costs, what they really mean is they want to cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid right out of existence, and on top of cutting their hard-earned benefits, the Republicans want to make the middle class pay—pay for Big Oil's big subsidies, pay for higher drug prices, pay for astronomical CEO salaries, for higher taxes to start a small business.

The chairman of the House Budget Committee said yesterday, and I quote him, ''What we're doing here is we're having a great debate in Congress about how much spending we should cut. I mean, how cool is that?'' Well, I'd like to tell him it's not cool at all, Mr. Chairman, not when you're asking struggling families to shoulder the sacrifice. Giving a sweetheart deal to corporate special interests and asking the middle class to pay for it—not cool at all.

The Republicans' continuing resolution and no-jobs agenda—bad for America, totally uncool.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the Flake amendment, and I strongly oppose the underlying Republican no-jobs continuing resolution.

If people out there have the gnawing feel that the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer, and they're stuck in the middle and stuck getting the bill, the fact of the matter is they're right. This bill is just another example of the Republicans' true agenda, which is helping out big business and the rich while sticking it to the middle class and those who aspire to it.

The cuts that they're proposing would actually cause a devastating wave of unemployment at the State and local level, particularly in the public sector. The Economic Policy Institute has estimated that passage would cost us nearly 1 million jobs. Who are we talking about? You know, it's cool these days to go after public sector workers, but what we're talking about are the teachers—I was one once a long time ago—the teachers who teach our children and grandchildren, the very police who keep our streets safe and put their lives on the line, and the firefighters who answer our 9/11 emergency call. We're talking about workers who are the backbone of our communities.

Over the last 2 years, the Democratic Congress and President Obama were successfully able to stave off a second Great Depression, but we're still in the early stages of recovery, unemployment is still too high at 9 percent, and American families are still suffering. The proposed cuts would cost us 1 million more jobs, be devastating to our recovery, and hurt Americans trying to take care of their families and make ends meet.

Let's just take a look at some of the things they want to cut. How about the National Institutes of Health would be cut $1.6 billion? This is funding that goes to vital medical research, including cures and improved treatments for devastating diseases. High speed rail development, which would provide desperately needed jobs, but beyond that, reinvigorate a keystone of the American infrastructure, it faces $2.5 billion in cuts.

In addition to the important jobs program, what really hurts is Republicans want to put assistance to poor families on the cutting board. They want to cut $1 billion for community health centers, the only access to health care for many poor families. And how about $747 million for the Women, Infants and Children, the WIC program? That's food assistance for low-income pregnant women and their children. The 300,000 beneficiaries in my State of Illinois receive a grand average benefit of $44.62 a month. That's it, per person, per month, and that minimal subsidy would be cut.

House Republicans' proposals to slash Federal spending programs are irresponsible and indiscriminate, eliminating programs that create jobs and cutting assistance for low-income and middle class families. There is another way to deal with the deficit and to balance our budget.

We need to enact a Democratic initiative to make it in America. We should be making things here. We should revive our manufacturing sector rather than providing tax breaks that encourage companies to go offshore.

I offered a plan last year as part of President Obama's 18-member National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform to make investments that get us out of the economic doldrums, boost job creation, and reduce the deficit—and not on the backs of low-income and middle-income Americans.

We can do it. We need to stop the Republican efforts and protect job-creating programs that benefit the middle class and the safety net programs that help the most vulnerable in our society because that's who we are as Americans.

The Republicans refuse to make the investments necessary to get people back to work because they refuse to give up tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires. Their policies are a prescription for disaster, one that puts families, communities, and our Nation at risk.

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

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

Mr. FILNER. I'm a little disappointed in the amendment by my friend from Arizona. This is our biggest deficit hawk in the House. He wants to cut $18 million from the Defense budget. Did I get that number right, Mr. FLAKE, $18 million? I mean, we've got a $612 billion Defense budget. What are you, .000001 percent of the budget? Not good for a Senator from Arizona, Mr. FLAKE.

I would say let's really get at this. Man, you want to cut the budget? Republican President and Republican Congress funded a whole two wars off the budget. We're talking about trillions of dollars added to our deficit. You don't go after those, Mr. FLAKE. We need you to go after those. We will gladly support you. Eighteen million out of a $612 billion budget? I'll vote for the amendment, and you know, whenever I vote for one, you win.

But let's go after some real stuff in that Pentagon budget, and let's not go after jobs as this underlying bill does. Come on. You know, you talked about jobs the whole campaign. I haven't seen a pro-job bill yet from the Republicans in this Congress, and yet this bill, H.R. 1, cuts millions of jobs.

□ 1610

I am on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Mr. FLAKE. I don't know if you know about it, but the cuts to the clean water moneys—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Members are advised to address their comments to the Chair, and not to other Members in the second person.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, did you know that the bill cuts millions of jobs from our economy, the cuts to the Clean Water Act, the cuts to the High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Program, and other infrastructure cuts? In my State of California, we are losing, just on this bill, almost 50,000 jobs; the total jobs around the country, almost 300,000. Come on. This is not a way to both cut the deficit and keep our economy going.

I happen to represent a border district. I represent the whole Mexican border with California. Madam Chair, I'm sure Mr. FLAKE knows very well the border in Arizona, and he knows that in this bill, the GSA construction and acquisition funding line has been eliminated—eliminated—$894 million worth.

I don't know about in the State that Mr. FLAKE represents, but I'll tell you, in California, you are eliminating the several-hundred-million-dollar modernization of two of the biggest border crossings in our country and the biggest one in the world.

In my district, 300,000 people cross the border every day legally—legally—and they're crossing mainly for jobs and for shopping. We all know we need to make that far more efficient, that crossing, so people can spend money in our country and create jobs. You have eliminated the whole modernization moneys out of this budget, and I'm sure it affects Arizona.

The Otay Mesa crossing where we have all the commercial crossings in California, gone. The biggest border crossing in the world in San Ysidro, gone. Another big one in my district, Calexico, California, gone.

We are leaving billions of dollars on the table, Madam Chair, for jobs in our economy. If we don't have efficient border crossings, we don't have trade. We don't have shopping. We don't have the crossings that are legal that we all want to encourage. These modernization programs went directly at that, not only in California but in Texas, in New Mexico, and I'm sure in Arizona. And yet all those jobs that are created by more efficient crossings are now thrown away.

So the gentleman from Arizona who wants to give up efficient border crossings in his State, you might tell him, Madam Chairman, I don't think that's a good way to run for the Senate. Taking $18 million out of a defense budget of $612 billion is pretty miserly stuff. It's not even a good symbol for a guy running for Senate in the United States.

We should really go after what the Republicans said they are going after. Let's end the war in Afghanistan, save trillions of dollars off the deficit. But more importantly, the cuts that we have seen in infrastructure in this country, the cuts we have seen in GSA are costing hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of jobs. This is a job buster. It should be defeated.

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

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I rise to strike the last word.

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

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, while I support the Flake amendment, I oppose the underlying continuing resolution.

The Republicans are here today offering another piece of their ''no jobs'' agenda, and they are in disarray and are hastily pushing an irresponsible and dangerous spending bill that threatens jobs, undercuts American innovation, and jeopardizes investments in rebuilding America.

Creating jobs, protecting the middle class, and reducing the deficit are, indeed, my top priorities. We should be working together to accomplish these very valid goals. However, Republicans have controlled this House for 41 days, nearly 2 months, and brought up zero bills to create jobs. The mindless cuts that are on this floor today mean 1 million jobs cut, 1 million jobs cut from our economy—no jobs for nurses, no jobs for teachers, no jobs for police, no jobs for firefighters, no jobs for manufacturing, no jobs for small businesses.

You cut the deficit by putting America back to work, not by cutting Social Security. Republicans aim to cut Social Security and Medicare. When Republicans say they are cutting costs, they mean cutting Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid until they don't exist. Ask my seniors in the 21st Congressional District of New York, and they'll tell you to leave alone the Social Security system that has served them well.

Republicans want to make you pay, make you pay for Big Oil's billion-dollar subsidies, make you pay for higher drug prices, make you pay taxes to start a small business, make you pay for CEO salaries, let Main Street take a hit while Wall Street gets a bonus. The American people want Republican leaders to look out for constituents first, not their corporate friends. This careless resolution cuts jobs and damages our economy.

Just 6 weeks after taking charge of the House, Republicans are not just ignoring jobs; they are cutting them, and they admit it. This morning, our Speaker, Speaker BOEHNER, had a response to our concern that this bill destroys—destroys—American jobs. And he said, ''So be it.'' Well, I guess that he meant, so be it if there are 1,300 fewer cops on the beat, because this bill terminates the COPS hiring program. So be it if there are 2,400 fewer firefighters on the job protecting their communities, because this bill eliminates funding for SAFER grants. So be it if there are 20,000 fewer researchers at the National Science Foundation. So be it if there are 25,000 lost construction jobs and 76 construction projects are canceled in 40 States. So be it if there are 200,000 children kicked out of Head Start programs, and so be it if thousands of teachers will lose their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, ''so be it'' isn't a good enough answer for the hardworking middle class of our country.

I agree with the President that we must out-innovate, out-educate, and out-build the rest of the world. We will continue to measure every effort by whether it creates jobs, strengthens the middle class, and reduces the deficit.

I have submitted eight amendments to this irresponsible Republican spending bill to protect and grow jobs, out-innovate other countries in clean energy, protect our seniors, and ensure quality education for our children.

I support efforts to balance the budget. However, I will not support a spending bill that threatens our economic recovery, that cuts 1 million jobs just after we have created 1.2 million private sector jobs since last March, and is achieved on the backs of senior citizens, children, and the working middle class.

Republicans have gone too far, sacrificing Americans' health, safety, and future in order to protect their special interests while offering no real plan to create jobs.

Madam Chair, the American people are united, and they are saying one thing: Show us the jobs.

I urge defeat of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the Flake amendment and also to the underlying bill, and I join Leader PELOSI and my colleagues on this side of the aisle in calling this an irresponsible spending bill that threatens job and economic growth, hampers our global competitiveness, and harms the people who are hurting the most: the working families, the middle class, and the poor.

This CR targets vulnerable Americans because it would cut funding for the things they most desperately need, like food stamps, Head Start, and funding to heat their homes, all to keep a reckless tea party-driven campaign spending cuts goal. And at the end of the day, these kinds of hurtful cuts will never get us a balanced budget, and they certainly will not secure the kind of future we want for our children and grandchildren.

As one of the five representatives of the people of the U.S. offshore territories as well as the ranking member of the subcommittee that has jurisdiction over the territories, I am particularly troubled by the painful cuts this CR will make to the important programs that the people of the territories rely on.

The bill slashes 8.33 percent from the general technical assistance account of the Office of Insular Affairs. Madam Chair, the technical assistance program provides support not otherwise available to the insular areas to fight such things as the deteriorating fiscal conditions which are facing all of the islands and our ability to maintain the momentum that has been made in making and sustaining systemic changes.

□ 1620

These funds also support student training programs for high school and college students, as well as training for insular professionals in financial management, accounting and auditing, as well as other programs.

The program also provides funds to assist the islands in maintaining accreditation for our colleges and universities. What is critical about this meager program, which has not seen an increase in its budget in more than a decade, is that it is funding that the territories could not get anywhere else in the Federal Government. Sparing this very small but essential program from the majority's indiscriminate, meat cleaver approach to budgeting would do infinitely more good than any harm it might cause to the budget. After all, the small amount of money we're talking about here does not move the meter one blip.

Madam Chair, the people of the territories recognize that the Federal budget cannot sustain the path that it's on, and that reductions in spending must be made. But we have done our part and will continue to do our part to reduce Federal spending.

As you look at the budget for the territories, it has not increased in several years, and it has been cut for a number of those years. But the cuts we're talking about in the CR do not only affect the territories. In addition to cutting jobs, there are also disastrous cuts that the Republicans are proposing to health-related programs that are critical to millions of Americans and are integral to all of our efforts to achieve health equity and to eliminate health disparities. These health disparities, which we know leave millions of people of color, rural Americans, and low-income Americans in poorer health, without reliable access to adequate health care, and at greater risk for premature death from preventive causes, also cost the Nation a great deal from an economic point of view. In fact, we know that between 2003 and 2006, the combined direct and indirect cost of health disparities and the subsequent premature deaths that often result, the cost was $1.24 trillion.

Rather than base budget cuts on measures that will save human lives in addition to precious Federal resources, the Republicans are instead proposing cuts that will achieve the exact opposite. We all know from their efforts to repeal the landmark health care reform law, a law that has already begun to expand access to affordable high quality health care to more than 30 million Americans who were in the ranks of the uninsured, the Republicans either do not care about the importance of ensuring that every American and their families have health

care coverage, or they do not understand the value of such coverage in promoting health, wellness, and thus improving life opportunities, or maybe it's both.

And now, we also know that they don't care about or understand the benefits and the needs for the programs and efforts that will significantly improve the health and wellness of some of our Nation's most vulnerable residents by reducing the very health disparities that cost this Nation so much in human lives and in money. In fact, they want to cut more than $1 billion from the Nation's community health centers, the very centers that provide medical homes to millions of hard-working Americans whose health care needs would be poorly addressed without them, and to cut $210 million from maternal and child health block grant programs, more than $300 million from family planning, and $758 million from the WIC program, all of which would have a detrimental impact on the health and wellness of women and children and young families across this country.

I urge my colleagues to reject this budget CR which does nothing to improve the economy and hurts vulnerable Americans.

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

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Yesterday, as we know, was Valentine's Day, but the majority here in Washington is showing no love for the families throughout the district that I represent and all across the rest of this country.

The new majority said they would cut wasteful spending. But instead they're slashing jobs for police officers, jobs for firefighters, jobs for teachers, and many other jobs, all across the country.

They told us they would work to eliminate needless layers of bureaucracy, but instead they're cutting heating assistance for the elderly, food aid for young mothers and infants, and college aid for 15,000 students in the district that I represent and hundreds of thousands of other students all across the country.

They said they would focus on the economy, but instead, they're eliminating energy research and development that we need to create green jobs and compete with other countries around the world. They're sending the workers home on 76 high-speed rail projects underway in 40 states, all very necessary. This hurts real people. It does nothing to address our long-term deficit, and middle class families are the ones who pay the price. The American people don't want more hidden cuts and budgets tricks. We need a plan. We need a solid, secure positive plan.

The national debt we hold today was not created over the last 2 years, as some people are saying. The fiscal crisis we are facing today was inherited from the Bush administration. Under the previous administration, annual budget surpluses were turned into annual deficits. It was Vice President Dick Cheney who said deficits don't matter. Clearly, that's a lesson the new majority has learned well because while they do cut spending with this CR, this bill will undoubtedly worsen our budget deficit. Why? Because it will kill hundreds of thousands of jobs. That means more people unemployed.

The people didn't send us here to tend to the needs of Wall Street and oil company CEOs. So why does the majority stand against the plan to end special tax earmarks that would actually cut the deficit?

We could be discussing how to end government redtape. For instance, in 5 years we could save many billions of dollars by allowing Medicare to negotiate lower prescription drug prices for seniors. But instead, the majority here wants to cut the administrative budget for Social Security. This plan hurts New Yorkers and others all across the country. And it hurts the district that I represent. Fifteen thousand college students in places like Ithaca and New Paltz will get hurt with the maximum Pell Grant falling by $800 as the cost of college continues to go up for students all across America.

And 123,000 low-income pregnant women and new moms in New York will get less assistance with the pre- and postnatal nutrition they need. That will happen to thousands and thousands of others all across the country.

Nearly 2 million New Yorkers who apply for LIHEAP this year will find it harder to heat their homes next year, as will so many thousands of others across the country.

Job training programs like Job Corps in Sullivan County, which will help high school dropouts get the training they need to get good jobs, will get cut out too.

Like a blindfolded child at a pinata party, this continuing resolution takes a bat to all the wrong things at exactly the wrong time. I would urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Stand up for the American people. Stand up for a real plan to reduce the deficit, and fight to save the jobs this country needs so desperately.

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

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

Mr. DOLD. Madam Chair, I appreciate the opportunity to be here. I rise in support of the Flake amendment and know that we, at this point in time, the American public has asked us to tighten our belt. We have to do so. And I believe we have to talk and look at every single department, including the Department of Defense. This specific amendments deals with a very small amount in the Department of Defense, one that Secretary Gates has already outlined and determined that they do not need. This will not jeopardize those that are in harm's way. This will not jeopardize military preparedness. This is yet one small step.

We have, I think, over 400 amendments today, and I'm delighted that those on the other side of the aisle are in support of the Flake amendment, and so we certainly look for its passage.

This right now, what we're talking about in terms of reining in spending, is absolutely what the American people demand. Yes, we've had spending on both sides of the aisle. Washington has a spending problem. We need to cut back on spending. We're spending $1.48 trillion in deficit spending, and I think the President's budget actually brings it up to $1.6 trillion. That's over $3 million a minute in deficit spending.

□ 1630

I come from the private sector. I run a small business. I understand what is going on in the private sector, and I can tell you that out-of-control spending in Washington does not send the right signal and in fact does hurt jobs.

We have to get our fiscal house in order. This is what this is going to attempt to do, and we certainly know that out-of-control spending has not been the answer. I urge my colleagues to support the Flake amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I rise to address what I consider very serious problems with this continuing resolution and this defense budget and the lack of attention to jobs.

I am going to talk about something that's quite unpopular. We all know that we have 9 percent unemployment in this country, which is significant. We all know that communities all over America are suffering, not simply rural communities, not simply suburban areas, not simply inner cities. But people are hurting, having lost their jobs, all over America.

In some communities, it's not 9 percent, it's not 10 percent, it's not even 15 or 20 percent. We have communities in America where there is 30 and 40 percent unemployment.

There are those who would like to say, well, that's in those urban areas. No, it is not simply in urban areas. We have poor rural communities that have Representatives who come here every day talking about they are representing them, when in fact they never speak to the needs of those communities. They don't talk about the lack of health care that people have had to endure for so many years, the inability for people in these rural communities to access clinics. Some of us are fighting for all people, not only the cities and the towns, but these rural areas that are being hurt so badly.

Now, it is not popular to even use the word ''poor.'' As a matter of fact, you hear over and over again about concerns for the middle class. Of course, we are all concerned for the middle class. But who represents the poor people in America these days? There are some of us who do, and proudly so, and we are referred to as ''big spenders.'' Tax and spend, they say. And they don't talk about the poverty in their own community.

But let me just tell you, with this continuing resolution the CDBG, Community Development Block Grant, money is going to hurt all of these communities across America. Many of these Representatives who support cutting CDBG from $4.45 billion down to $1.5 billion are going to hurt their cities. Their mayors are absolutely going nuts about what is happening with the cutting of CDBG, the last block grant funding that they can depend on to assist with economic development that helps to create jobs in America.

You hear a lot about that we care about jobs. Well, we know what people care about jobs based on where they place their priorities. My friends are cutting in areas where we could be creating jobs and have demonstrated that they have zero bills to create jobs. The mindless cuts that they are proposing means 1 million job cuts: no jobs for nurses, teachers, police, firefighters, manufacturing, small businesses.

We need to put America back to work, and we can do this if we are sensible, if we are targeting the cuts in areas that can take it.

Why are we spending the amount that we are spending on the military budget and defense budget when we have those who are telling us—for example, Secretary Gates announced his intention to terminate the expeditionary fighting vehicle program and the surface launch medium-range air-to-air missile system. Why are we trying to disregard what we have been told by the very people who understand this defense budget better than anybody else?

No, we want to continue to fund a budget that doesn't need any funding, not talking about how we reduce and eliminate the funding for Afghanistan and bring our soldiers home and put that money into our own domestic needs. We are talking about somehow cutting in ways that they would have people believe that they are helping them when in fact they are hurting them.

This continuing resolution does nothing for strengthening the economy. It does nothing for creating jobs. It does nothing for support of those cities who are fighting desperately to hold on to opportunities for people who have nowhere else to turn. Not only do we have the cuts in areas that would create jobs, but also many of these areas are faced with foreclosures.

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

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

Ms. CHU. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment because it doesn't do anything to create jobs. Of course, I shouldn't be surprised. Over the last 6 weeks since the Republicans took over control of the House, they haven't created a single job. In fact, they haven't even put a single jobs bill on the House floor.

With this mindless job-killing Republican spending bill, they are hurting the American people. This bill senselessly cuts over 1 million jobs at a time when we need them most, at a time when we can least afford it. This is nothing more than a Republican pink slip for America.

This bill doesn't get our broken American economy back on track. Instead, Republicans are hitting American workers where it hurts. These merciless Republican cuts mean, if you work in manufacturing, no jobs; if you are a cop, no jobs; if you are a nurse, no jobs; if you are a teacher, no jobs; if you are a firefighter, no jobs; if you are a construction worker, no jobs.

Republicans aren't just ignoring jobs. They are slashing them. And that means pink slips for Americans across the country and across almost every industry. If we aren't helping real Americans, where is this money going? Right into the pockets of big defense contractors.

While Americans across the country are finding themselves out of work due to mindless Republican spending cuts, the military industrial complex will actually be making more money.

While they slash jobs and safety net programs, Republicans are actually increasing funding to the Department of Defense by $10 billion. This spending is excessive and way out of proportion with the needs of the American people.

Even Defense Secretary Gates has found $100 billion in cuts and savings to the Department of Defense while still keeping America safe. That's the entire cost of the job-killing cuts Republicans are asking for here today.

Instead of expanding our economy and growing the middle class, Republicans want to make you, the American people, pay. They want to make you pay to line the pockets of defense contractors, make you pay for Big Oil's billion-dollar subsidies, make you pay for higher drug prices, make you pay taxes to start a small business, make you pay for CEO salaries, make you take a hit while Wall Street gets a bonus. We need to look out for constituents first, not corporate friends.

And this bill isn't even about reducing deficits, because we all know that the best way to reduce the deficit is to put Americans to work, not carelessly gut government programs. Instead, we need to rebuild America and focus on winning the future.

Today's bill is a choice between cutting the deficit or putting Americans back to work, and I am voting for jobs. We need to invest in our Nation so that we can out-innovate, out-educate, and out-build the rest of the world. I want to see the words ''Made in America'' again.

The American people voted for jobs, and all they are getting with this gutting and slashing funding proposal are pink slips. This is a heartless and careless plan that cuts real American jobs and hurts real American families.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1640

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, the amendment before us is a start. Eighteen million dollars out of $720 billion is a start. You might take it one step forward and let's end the war in Afghanistan where we're spending $120 billion and another $30 billion or so in Iraq. Now we've got some real money to talk about.

Because this is a start, I find that it's an unworthy start, and, therefore, I oppose the amendment. However, the real issue before America is not how we can slash and burn in foolish ways that actually lose tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, indeed a million jobs in the next 7 months, which is the proposal before us with this continuing resolution that the Republican Caucus has put on the floor. It seems to me that if we wanted to create jobs, we certainly wouldn't, as a first step, lose a million jobs in virtually every sector of the economy:

Teachers that are providing services for the early childhood education programs, Head Start, they'll lose their jobs.

Firefighters; 2,400 or more of them will lose their job across the Nation. The COPS program, which has provided jobs for police in our cities, they'll lose their jobs, some 1,300. They just had men and women from my own district come in and say, Why would they want to do that? Why would they want to take cops off the street? I told them, I don't know. I don't understand.

I don't understand this CR. It is the most foolish, nonsensical slash-and-burn I have ever seen. I was in the Department of the Interior in the mid nineties when we actually reduced in a thoughtful way over a 4-year period of time the number of employees by some 12,000—from 90,000 down to the 70,000 range. We did it. And we continued to do the services. But you don't slash and burn. You don't just in a wholesale manner carry out a political promise of $100 billion and foist it upon the American public in this way where we lose a million jobs, where we lose critical services.

California has been in a water war for generations. We rely upon the Bureau of Reclamation. We rely upon recycling. We rely upon these programs. And yet you slash those, and those are real jobs and real programs to deal with the water problems in the West. Why would you do that? What's the

point of that? Why would you go into programs where we need to educate?

My daughter is a second grade teacher. She now has 32 kids in her elementary program; an almost impossible situation. And your cuts that you're proposing will make that situation worse. She cried out to me this week, Why are they doing that, Dad? I said, for some political promise made in a campaign without any thinking about the impact that it has on real human beings, real students, who are trying to get an education.

My final point is this. There are five things that lead to true economic growth. The best education system in the world, and so this CR cuts education. The best research in the world, and so this CR cuts research programs in science, in energy, in health care. The best infrastructure, and this CR cuts infrastructure expenditures. Manufacturing matters; we have to make it in America. You cut out those programs that assist manufacturing. And, finally, we know that we have to have an energy policy and you destroy the beginnings of a green energy, self-sustaining energy program in this Nation.

Why would you do so many foolish things? I don't get it. Perhaps it's because your real agenda is the no-jobs agenda.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Madam Chair, we've had promise after promise after promise after promise that the Republicans were going to pay attention to what the people wanted. And what the people want is jobs, jobs, jobs.

I rise in opposition to this amendment, Madam Chair. I want to point out that these Republican cuts that have been proposed are draconian, they are extremist, they are bad for America. They are bad for our economic recovery. Everybody knows that we just came out of the worst recession since the Great Depression. We call it the Great Recession. We're just coming out of it, even though most Americans don't feel it yet. Certainly those folk up on Wall Street who got the bailouts, they feel the recovery, and they are back to the huge bonuses and salaries. They are looking at this Republican Congress to release them from all of the regulatory measures that the Democrats put in place over the last 2 years so that they can continue to party. And while they party, their friends here in Congress on the Republican side of the aisle are busy trying to balance the budget on the backs of working men and women in this country. That's what the CR proposal is all about.

It came out on Friday at 8 p.m.; they issued their plan, and here we are on Tuesday arguing the merits—or demerits, actually—of this plan that is nothing other than a plan that undermines America's future. This plan is going to cause severe job cuts which will hurt our economic recovery.

It is ironic that as reported in the Wall Street Journal, a new Wall Street Journal survey of economists shows that they expect the economy to expand at the fastest pace since 2003—a recovery that would be certainly jeopardized, snuffed out, by this GOP plan. This is going to cut at least 300,000 private sector jobs, according to an analysis by staff at the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. These cuts, by the way, these 300,000 cuts are less than half of the total infrastructure cuts in the bill. These Republican cuts in investments in roads, bridges, transit and rail include a cut of $1.4 billion in clean water State revolving loan fund moneys, which is $23 million for Georgia; and include a cut of $6.3 billion in high-speed intercity rail funding. That's going to cause people to not be able to go out and work to make that investment in America's future a reality.

□ 1650

A $75 million cut in the TIGER II Program, those are transit projects, is what will happen in Georgia, just in the State of Georgia. So we are talking about massive job losses, 300,000 just with transportation and infrastructure projects, Madam Chairman. The consequence of that extends into our future. It is actually strangling the future of millions of Americans, both working and poor people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam Chairman, I won't take anywhere near that time, just simply to get back to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. FLAKE, which is the matter before us right now, and to say that I support this amendment, Madam Chairman.

The gentleman has very properly, I think, brought up something that the Secretary of Defense has said is one of the areas in which the defense budget can be reduced and we can save money. The greatest threat to the national security of this country today is our debt. The Secretary of Defense has said that. He has said certainly it is a national security threat, as has the Secretary of State. So we need to get this debt down, we need to get this deficit down, we need to do it in every single area of the budget.

I think the gentleman from Arizona's amendment is very proper and a very appropriate one, and I support it.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Chairman, I rise to, first of all, support the Flake amendment but also to oppose the underlying bill and the drastic cuts that will devastate the most vulnerable citizens in our Nation.

Just to highlight some of these cuts, the bill will cut $25 million from the Ryan White HIV-AIDS Program and the Aides Drug Assistance Program, ADAP. Now, ADAP is a program of last resort for the poorest Americans who don't qualify for Medicaid or Medicare. Currently there is a waiting list of over 6,000 people in 10 States to receive benefits from this program.

And $850 million in reductions to the CDC, an organization whose first task is to defend us against disease and infection, $850 million. That is smart. Let's just cut and make America more vulnerable.

The bill cuts $1.6 billion in funding for NIH, so I guess we won't need any research since we are going to let the diseases run rampant in America.

It goes so far as to say in the District of Columbia, we are even going to tell you how to spend your very last dollar.

But it gets better. Community Health Centers, Community Health Centers, where the most vulnerable are treated for their health, $1.3 billion in cuts. Community Health Centers will lose the capacity to serve 11 million patients over the next year, and well over 3.3 million current patients will lose their care within the next few months.

The bill cuts $5 billion from the Pell Grants. I did hear that there were a lot of new millionaires elected to the Congress of the United States, so I imagine they can pay for their children's education. But maybe we should think about people that don't have the median income of Members of Congress, people who don't make $175,000 a year, which puts all of us in the top 1 percent of wage earners.

What about the most humble and the poorest and those who wish to aspire one day to lead this great Nation of ours? Shouldn't they be given an opportunity? Not under this program. Let's cut the program, the basic program that allows young men and women to seek a college education, the Pell Grant. Let's eliminate billions of dollars from there also.

But wait, $25 billion to the Federal TRIO Program. That is for the first generation. That is the first kid in a family where nobody has gone to college. Let's cut from that program too.

The program cuts $25 million from GEAR UP. And, wait, $1 billion from Head Start?

I am just going to end with this. I want the public to understand this. We get great health care here, excellent health care. It is not free, but we get great health care. About $400, that is what they deduct from my check. My wife gets good health care, my daughter gets good health care, and so do every one of you get good health care. Shame on anybody that would adopt this kind of budget, knowing very well

the kind of great health care that we get. Cut your health care first before you cut the health care of the most poorest, the most vulnerable in this Nation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of Mr. FLAKE's amendment to cut wasteful defense spending. Unfortunately, the underlying bill is just another part of the Republican no jobs agenda. Since the Republican caucus has taken over the majority, they haven't put one jobs bill on. I mean, they haven't done a poor job—they haven't done anything. It is as if they are not in favor of Americans having jobs. We know they are, but they haven't demonstrated it in anything they have done, which is the important thing.

Instead, as part of the Republican no jobs agenda, they bring up a bill to cut 1 million jobs, cut 1 million jobs from the American middle class. These cuts are Republican answers for the job crisis that they created. Cutting 1 million jobs. If you are a nurse, no jobs. If you are a teacher, no jobs. If you are a firefighter or police officer, no jobs. If your jobs are from American manufacturing, no jobs. And if you are a small business person, who is going to have any money to even go into your store? No jobs for them either. The list goes on and on.

If you want to know how we cut the deficit, it is by putting America to work, not by cutting Social Security. Make no mistake: When the Republicans say they are cutting costs, they are cutting Social Security, they are cutting Medicare, they are cutting Medicaid, until they cease to exist. Republicans want working Americans to shoulder the whole burden, the burden of a taxpayer-funded spending spree for the rich while protecting millionaires and billionaires who refuse to pay their fair share.

The Republican answer to the crisis they created is, you pay, American people. They must make you pay for Big Oil's billion dollar subsidies. They want to make you pay for higher drug prices. They want to make you pay for taxes to start a small business. They want to make you pay for CEO bonuses. They want Main Street to take the hit while Wall Street gets a bonus.

While Democrats work to create jobs, reduce the deficit, and rebuild America, Republican Speaker JOHN BOEHNER said, so be it if we lose hundreds of thousands of jobs.

Is that what the American people said they wanted in November? The American people want Republican leaders to look out for constituents first, not corporate friends. And now the American people are saying, show us the jobs.

We have been seeing a no jobs agenda, a jobless agenda. Forty days in the majority, and nothing to create jobs. No jobs for the American people. Madam Chairman, we need to make this change.

Will the Republican caucus even today, Madam Chairman, say you know what, we are not going to cut 1 million people, 1 million public employees out of work. We are going to actually do something to create jobs? It appears not, Madam Chairman.

What we need to do is withdraw some of these massive oil subsidies. What we need to do is save some money by not rewarding the wealthiest among us and industries who have not been responsible corporate citizens and actually use it to put Americans back to work so that they can pay some taxes and actually reduce this deficit.

Make no mistake about it, Madam Chairman, we are concerned about the deficit: $200 billion of it goes to interest on the debt. That money could be going to programs that help people, to help children, to help seniors, that can make and strengthen and improve our infrastructure and our country. But instead it goes to this massive debt, built up by Republicans with their massive tax cuts to the rich, two wars and a big pharma giveaway. They created the problem. Now when we try to solve it, they want to put us back in the hole.

□ 1700

So, Madam Chair, I want to say that if this country—our country—has a deficit to fix, let's fix it by a bold, creative, courageous vision of America where we create infrastructure, we create work, we create jobs, rather than just cutting back the social safety net and taking away what little people have. We need to stop the Republican no-jobs agenda.

I yield back.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Chair, sometimes this is a complex debate when we hear words like ''CR'' to a lot of our voters and others who are paying attention to the work that they have sent us here to do. And a lot of times they try to ensure that we use vernacular that, what does it mean? We're in the budget year of 2012 or budget year 2011 or we're doing a CR. I think the plain and simple of it is we're trying to ensure that what you are getting now if you're on a job, if you're a police officer, that we don't turn the lights out on you. And my concern is to let you know that we have been steadily improving. The private sector has been creating jobs under the Democratic policies under President Obama's guidance and, frankly, under this new budget that we'll debate—that is not what we're debating today—that speaks about competitiveness and speaks about infrastructure rebuild, putting Americans to work.

So my gripe with the CR that my friends on the other side of the aisle have now put forward is that they originally came up with a $60- to $74 billion—maybe a thoughtful analysis of what we could cut. Remember, this is in the middle of you working and all of a sudden somebody comes and gives you a pink slip. But rather than stick with what might have been a thoughtful analysis—and, again, I had not studied it; it had not been introduced—all of a sudden they go by the ''We have to be dominated by voices of which force us, without thought, to now make it a hundred billion dollars.''

I'm as angry about the deficit and want a strong budget, which we're not doing right now, and want to work with my good ranking member, chairman of the Defense Subcommittee in the last Congress, Mr. DICKS, on a thoughtful passage going forward, but I want to make sure we stay on a pathway of creating jobs.

There is something to cutting spending. You have my commitment. We came out with a compromise 2 months ago, in December. Some of us agreed; some of us did not. But there were sizable tax cuts. I voted for tax cuts before. But let me tell you why what we're doing today is enormously dangerous: 1,330 cops will be off the street; 2,400 fewer firefighters will be off the street; we will take teachers out of classrooms and lose 25,000 new construction jobs.

There is a provision in the CR that wants to rescind stimulus dollars—sounds like a bad thing—but those dollars are in the pipeline for construction projects where men and women of America are working and feeding their families. Does that make sense, dollars that they pay taxes back to this country?

I don't understand a plan that takes from the working man and woman in this country. I don't understand a plan, for example, that takes $2.5 billion away from high-speed rail, which all over America there has been a sense of inspiration about moving us to more efficient transportation. But the number of jobs to be created cannot be counted. That's an investment in this country. Or do you want to undermine the air traffic control system and begin to trouble America's airways? I sit on the Homeland Security Committee, chair the Transportation Security Committee. I am very hesitant to make a willy-nilly cut to the FAA.

And so what disturbs me is: Why could we jump or why did we jump or how do we jump in 48 hours from $60 million to $74 million of which they said they were cutting? This is a continuing resolution, which means it allows the government, in essence, to keep going on what we are ongoing with. It means people are out there working, doing the bidding of the American people. And, before you know it, because there were complaints and people talking about what they campaigned on, and all of a sudden it's a $100 billion cut with no thought.

Now, I respect people being elected by their constituents, but it is interesting when you read polling numbers from individuals who happen to come from that background of the tea party that want to cut everything, and you ask them about something in their jurisdiction. Say, for example, an Air Force base. The polling numbers show, Don't cut my Air Force base, but you can cut somebody else's.

So here's my concern, Madam Chair. How do you cut Juvenile Justice and the COPS program? How do you cut the Justice Department for all of the voting rights enforcement?

I want to stay on a path. This CR is not a pathway of creating jobs; it's no jobs, and it stops America in her tracks. Let's stay on track and keep investing in jobs in America.

Ms. EDWARDS. Madam Chair, I rise to strike the last word.

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Madam Chair, I rise today because I want to express my concern that I think of the House of Representatives as a place that involves a lot of critical thinking about the work that we do, but the continuing resolution in front of us is neither critical nor thoughtful. It eliminates the COPS program.

Let me tell you about the COPS program, not just around the country where it's going to result in firing 1,330 law enforcement officers, but in one of the counties that I represent where we have had, unfortunately, 18 homicides since the beginning of the year, where we need every law enforcement officer on the beat. Fifty of those officers come from the COPS program. We would lose those officers under this continuing resolution.

Looking at the firing of our firefighters, these are firefighters, first responders out there whenever they're called in every one of our communities across the country, 2,400 of them.

Sometimes, Madam Chair, we speak in numbers that are so extraordinary that ordinary Americans don't understand them. But I think with respect to this continuing resolution, ordinary Americans understand that under the resolution 200,000 students—that's prekindergartners—will be kicked out of Head Start just when we need to give these students a start so that we can grow them and educate them so they're competitive in the 21st century. We're not doing that. Instead, 200,000 students in every State of this country kicked out of Head Start, thousands of teachers who teach them.

This brings me to another cut, a number that the American people understands, Madam Chair—$845. $845 is the amount that would be cut from the Pell Grant program; $845, for those of us who sent a child to college, is the cost of books for the semester.

Madam Chair, I am so shocked by these cuts that I think across this country, the students, if they're not going to get their $845 to buy their books, maybe they should send the bill to Speaker BOEHNER, send their book bill to the Speaker.

I am challenged to understand these cuts, because when I think about an $845 cut to Pell Grants, in my State that's 123,000 students. Madam Chair, in Michigan, it's 646,000 students; in Arizona, it's 340,000 students; millions of students across the country who lose $845 that allows them to buy their biology books, their economics books, their math books, the things that will enable them to be competitive in this century. So, like many Americans, I really don't get that. It is neither thoughtful nor critical.

This cut would mean $2.5 billion in cuts to the National Institutes of Health for cancer research and for other diseases that plague our country and send our health care costs skyrocketing. We want to cut scientists and researchers and medical professionals who are trying to cure the great diseases of our time?

□ 1710

I don't understand it, and I don't think the American public understands it.

And $1.4 billion in cuts for science and energy research, the very thing that will make us competitive in this next generation. The American people don't understand that.

Children, 200,000 of them, in Head Start. Firefighters, 2,400 of them. Police officers, 1,330 of them; 123,000 students in the State of Maryland losing their 845 lousy dollars to buy their books.

Madam Chair, I have to tell you that I think, like many of us in this Congress, we know that we need to bring spending under control, but it cannot be at the expense of working people. It cannot be at the expense of poor people. So it is a sad day in the United States when this Congress has exercised neither critique nor thought in bringing cuts that will devastate the American people and result in no job creation yet again for the last 45 days of this Congress.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chair, I want to remind everyone that we are on the Defense appropriations bill. This is the Flake amendment, and we have cut approximately $15 billion from this defense bill. I understand that there is a lot of concern about the other items here, but I just wanted to make that point.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida if he has anything he wants to say at this point.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, America is at war. We have soldiers fighting, losing their lives, having serious injuries not only in Afghanistan but in Iraq and, before that, in Kosova and in Bosnia. We have known war for a long time, and cutting the defense budget was unheard of. Yet the subcommittee has been able to recommend $14.8 billion in a very short period of time that we don't think has any negative effect on the national defense.

The idea of the Flake amendment may be a good idea. The subcommittee would like to be able to analyze it to make sure that it doesn't have any kind of a negative effect. It may be, as we go through our process for this year, that we would include that, but the subcommittee would very much like to have an opportunity to review this recommendation by the Flake amendment.

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

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

Mr. SARBANES. I wanted to speak to the underlying CR, H.R. 1.

Madam Chair, in particular I want to speak to the fact that the American people have been very clear in their understanding that what we need to do is rebuild the country and that we need to rebuild America. Yet everything that is being proposed by the Republicans in this continuing resolution undermines that goal.

Rebuilding America means rebuilding our infrastructure, and we can talk about that infrastructure in a number of different ways. We can talk about rebuilding and investing in our physical infrastructure. That's roads, bridges, tunnels, highways, and building up the strength of our physical infrastructure, which we all know we have to do. All you have to do is look at the newspaper or watch television, and you will see examples every day of the crumbling infrastructure out there. So we have got to commit to that, but the Republican budget would undermine that objective.

We have to rebuild the civic infrastructure of this country and keep it strong. What do I mean by the ''civic infrastructure''? I am talking about service programs like AmeriCorps and the Corporation for National and Community Service, which creates an infrastructure that says to those people who want to volunteer and serve their country—1,000 points of light—we are here to partner with you in doing that. Yet the Republican proposal would zero out that civic infrastructure.

It's about investing in human infrastructure and building up human capital. That's education and health care and job training and innovation and technology. That's what human capital and human infrastructure is about. Yet we can look through this budget and find examples of cutting those priorities as well.

How does that build up America? That tears America down. It doesn't build it up.

As for the last piece of this, if you're going to make America strong and keep it strong, you've got to preserve the natural resources of this country. I

looked at a couple of the numbers here in terms of what's being done that would hurt our environment under the proposal. I'll just mention a couple of them.

Cutting the Environmental Protection Agency by 29 percent, a $3 billion proposed cut. Now, how are you going to protect the environment if you cut by almost a third the agency whose mission it is to do that? That's essentially giving a free license to the polluters of America. That's an unconscionable proposal.

I come from Maryland. We care about the Chesapeake Bay in Maryland. It has been a national commitment to preserve this national treasure, the Chesapeake Bay. Last year, through an executive order, the President made it a priority. There are partnerships at the Federal, State and local levels and with the private sector to try to save and protect the Chesapeake Bay, but these proposals would undermine that.

Cutting over $1.7 billion from the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds. In Maryland, that would cost 1,000 jobs. This is an important source of financing for people to implement best practices to clean up the Chesapeake Bay. Why would we undermine that?

There are other elements with respect to our natural resources. We've got to enforce pollution standards. The EPA is in a position to do that, but not if we cut their funding. This would endanger rivers and streams that feed the Chesapeake Bay.

The last observation I would make, and this is sort of the overarching concern that I have, is that I really believe in the idea of citizen stewardship, in the idea that ordinary citizens step forward every day and decide they're going to commit themselves to cleaning up the environment. Our young people are committed to that, the next generation; but they want to see that the Federal Government is going to be a real partner in that effort. If we abdicate that responsibility, then there are going to be a lot of young people, a lot of ordinary citizens, who are going to get disillusioned in terms of their own commitment to cleaning up the environment.

We need to step forward. We need to stay strong and be a partner in protecting our environment; but what the Republicans have proposed in this continuing resolution would completely undermine that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Chair, the underlying bill is a special insult to the Americans who voted for the new majority on the promise of jobs. They might forgive that the mjority does not know how to produce jobs or that they haven't produced jobs yet, but they will never understand a bill that will make history on the number of jobs it affirmatively destroys.

The deficit commission warned about cuts that are at the centerpiece of the majority's bill, cuts that don't distinguish between short-term and long-term deficits, between the job-producing role of government investment during an economic turndown and the needed savings to reduce the long-term deficit, which must go on simultaneously; but the majority loses its focus entirely with its obsession on snatching local authority, over local funds from the District of Columbia.

While the majority wants to make draconian cuts in most Federal programs, putting at high risk the economy itself, it simultaneously expands Federal power into the local funds and affairs of a local jurisdiction, the District of Columbia. Three riders in this bill are anti-self-government, having nothing to do with the underlying bill or the Federal Government.

□ 1720

Particularly cruel, apart from the home-rule violation, is the attempt to reimpose a provision that would keep the District of Columbia from spending its own local funds on needle exchange programs. If this is reimposed, a rider I got off during the last few years, it will cost lives and spread HIV, as it did for the prior 10 years.

But they're not through there. The majority takes a hard-line approach, even when I asked for and was denied the right to testify before the Judiciary Committee on yet another rider, a rider that would keep local District of Columbia funds from being spent on abortions for poor women. What business is it of any Member of this body how the District of Columbia spends its own money, which it raises from its own residents and businesses?

Mr. Speaker, they go further. They try to reestablish a voucher program in the District, ignoring a compromise reached last Congress to allow every child now with a private school voucher to remain in the program until graduation. It disregards the fact that the District has the largest public charter school alternative in the United States. Almost half of our children attend these schools. If the majority wants to give money for alternatives to public schools, then they've got to respect our choice.

Republican support for vouchers—only in the District of Columbia—exposes them for where they really stand on vouchers and school choice. There is wholesale support in this body for public charter schools. They will not bring a voucher bill for the Nation to the floor because polls and referenda in the States show there is zero national support for private school vouchers. Instead, Republicans single out the District and only the District, ignoring the city's own extraordinary, flowering public charter school program. Our choice, not someone else's who has nothing to do with us.

You cannot try on this floor to slash Federal power while dictating local policy and how local money should be spent. Those two don't go together.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. COHEN. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I could spend my time talking about the cuts to the Low Income Heating and Energy Program, LIHEAP, and that's important because there are many people in my district suffering through the worst winter in Memphis' recent history and one of the worst winters in the country's history that need help with their utility bills more than ever. And that's, I think, an awful thing when people are suffering from the inability to pay their utility bills that we're cutting LIHEAP.

I could talk about what we're doing to law enforcement, cutting the COPS program that puts police on the street and helps local government put new policemen on the street to protect our people, and cuts to State law enforcement spending.

I could talk about the many calls and letters I've gotten from people concerned about title X cuts that will affect 5,500 in my community, women that won't be able to get family planning services, which include cancer screenings, annual exams in my city.

I could talk about cuts to NPR, cuts to the National Institutes of Health, where they're looking for cures for cancer and Alzheimer's and diabetes and other illnesses that affect our populace which we need to cure as soon as possible. Or cuts to the FDA, $241 million to keep our food safe and preserve public health.

Or cuts to Social Security and Medicaid. A gentleman stopped me Saturday and said, please, you tell the people in Washington, don't mess with our Social Security and Medicaid, but there are great cuts there as well.

Or the $18 billion cut to transportation—and Memphis is a transportation hub with rails and roadways and runways and river transportation, and $18 billion in cuts to transportation is going to hurt the growth of our economy and sending goods to market.

I could talk about any of those items. I could talk about the cuts to legal services and the fact that more and more people need legal services in these economic times. The housing crisis hasn't left us, and people need representation.

I could talk about cuts to education in historically black colleges and universities and Head Start programs. How are we going to compete, which we are not doing well in science and math, with the Chinese and the Indians if we cut these programs? I could talk about any and all those programs.

But one thing I want to do is I want to read a column called ''Eat the Future,'' and Paul Krugman, a Nobel

Prize-winning economist, wrote this. So I just think it's worthy to listen and have it heard on this floor what Mr. Krugman said yesterday, Nobel Prize-winning economist.

''On Friday, House Republicans unveiled their proposal for immediate cuts in Federal spending. Characteristically, they failed to accompany the release with a catchy slogan. So I'd like to propose one: Eat the Future.

''I'll explain in a minute. First, let's talk about the dilemma the GOP faces.

''Republican leaders like to claim that the midterms gave them a mandate for sharp cuts in government spending. Some of us believe that the elections were less about spending than they were about persistent high unemployment, but whatever. The key point to understand is that while many voters say that they want lower spending, press the issue a bit further and it turns out that they only want to cut spending on other people.

''That's the lesson from a new survey by the Pew Research Center, in which Americans were asked whether they favored higher or lower spending in a variety of areas. It turns out that they want more, not less, spending on most things, including education and Medicare. They're evenly divided about spending on aid to the unemployed and—surprise—defense.

''The only thing they clearly want to cut is foreign aid, which most Americans believe, wrongly, accounts for a large share of the Federal budget.

''Pew also asked people how they would like to see the States close their budget deficits. Do they favor cuts in either education or health care, the main expenses States face? No. Do they favor tax increases? No. The only deficit-reduction measure with significant support was cuts in public-employee pensions—and even there the public was evenly divided.

''The moral is clear. Republicans don't have a mandate to cut spending; they have a mandate to repeal the laws of arithmetic.

''How can voters be so ill informed? In their defense, bear in mind that they have jobs, children to raise, parents to take care of. They don't have the time or the incentive to study the Federal budget, let alone State budgets . . . So they rely on what they hear from seemingly authoritative figures.

''And what they've been hearing ever since Ronald Reagan is their hard-earned dollars are going to waste, paying for vast armies of useless bureaucrats—payroll is only 5 percent of Federal spending''—and others.

The bottom line is they've been hearing lies about the Federal budget. They've been hearing lies about the Federal bureaucracy. PolitiFact said that the biggest lie in 2009 was death panels. In 2010, it was government takeover of health care. If the Republicans get PolitiFact's Lie of the Year this year, they will get the Irving Thalberg lifetime achievement award. I hope they don't get it.

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Hawaii is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Chair, I don't believe there's anyone in this body who doesn't believe we must get ahold of our budget. I don't believe that there's anyone in this body who doesn't feel that when we do that, we've got to keep in mind that we serve the people, and we also must keep in mind that the one thing that we all are here to do is not to make their lives worse but to try to make their lives better, and in addition to that, we are here to try to build that public confidence which is the only way we will see the rise in our economy.

Madam Chair, when I looked at the amendment, the thing that struck me the most is that in my district, there was a provision in here that zeros out what is called the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant. It goes to zero. It's at $13 million now. In that same section, it also zeros out the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Public and Indian Housing revitalization of severely distressed public housing. It zeros out the Department of Housing and Urban Development's public and Indian housing. It zeros out the Department of Housing and Urban Development's community planning and development brownfields redevelopment, just to name some of the programs that have been zeroed out.

□ 1730

Let me tell you about the program of native Hawaiians. This is a program that, in our difficult economic times, managed to build, managed to build roads, managed to build programs. This is a program that was leveraged, leveraged so we had construction projects going, so we had housing developments going, and we have zeroed them out, $13 million, zeroed them out.

When we start to look at the budget and we start to think about what we must cut, the one thing I would like to think that we put a lot of credence in is which one of these programs is being leveraged and doing what we want.

In addition to that, Madam Chair, look at community health systems. Everyone knows the Hawaiian Islands are islands. The only mode of transportation for our people between islands is expensive airfare. We don't have a ferry system. We definitely don't have roads that join our islands. It's airlines. For the underserved, they have to fly for health care. So community health systems, when we cut $1 billion out of that budget, $1 billion, imagine what that means for the provision of one of the most essential, essential parts of a person's life, the feeling of knowing that you have health care, and we have cut that out of the budget. It's not only Hawaii; it's elsewhere. But think about what that means.

And for small communities who rely on CDBG, the Community Development Block Grant program, we've cut it approximately $2.5 billion. Why? That is what gets services to the people. This is what we have.

We have already discussed the fact many times that we are cutting Head Start. There are 200,000 young kids who are not going to get that opportunity.

We are cutting the Pell Grants, and that, of course, is going to make a reduction of about $800 per middle class family.

These are all part of this amendment as well.

But for myself, as someone who represents this State that's gotten zeroed out on a program that has done exactly—exactly—what government wants to see done, which is to make jobs, to give opportunities, we have cut it. Now, why would we do that? That is because we have not taken into consideration or remembered what we are here to do. We are here to serve the people, Madam Chair.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. I rise in support of this amendment but to oppose the underlying Republican continuing resolution.

The spending bill before us is born out of an ideology that cuts right to the heart of our values as a country, and our priorities, too. Because that is what a budget is supposed to reflect: our values and priorities as a nation. Our priorities are to strengthen the middle class, to reduce the deficit, and to create jobs.

And we can see very clearly where my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have placed their priorities. It's not in the well-being of our workforce, not in the effectiveness of our classrooms, not in the safety of our neighborhoods. The priorities of the majority party are not with the people who have worked hard all of their lives to earn a decent wage, buy a decent home, put their kids through school, and do what they can to keep their families and communities strong.

The priorities of my friends on the other side of the aisle lay with America's most successful: the hedge fund managers, Wall Street financiers, and the investment bankers. Our Republican colleagues are pushing a spending bill that is irresponsible and ignores the needs of a healing nation. It cuts jobs, threatens American innovation, and diminishes investments in rebuilding America. And to what extent? Well, I can tell you, as a former mayor, I have seen firsthand the consequences of what is being proposed. Some of the most egregious cuts come at the expense of our most vulnerable and some of the most immediate job creators and economic growth engines that I know of.

Our colleagues are gutting more than $340 million from the Community Service Block Grants and nearly $3 billion

from the Community Development Block Grant program. These are real dollars that are putting Americans back to work and helping small businesses in communities all across this Nation.

In addition, this budget slashes $1.6 billion in job training and cuts $120 million in alternative youth training that prepares kids for work in construction and other trades, critical skills that are necessary to help us make things again here in America.

Our colleagues, since assuming the majority last month, haven't offered one single piece of legislation that would create jobs. My friends on the other side of the aisle, at the same time that they are cutting billions of dollars in jobs programs that will help put Americans back to work, are continuing to support hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks to companies that are shipping our jobs overseas. While they cut 200,000 children from receiving early childhood education through Head Start, they are giving $43 billion in subsidies to the oil and gas companies.

This Republican proposal cuts Pell Grants for 9 million students, making it difficult and, for some, impossible to continue to go to college while at the same time continuing to give large agricultural corporations billions of dollars in Federal subsidies.

This is a question of priorities, and it's clear what the priorities of my friends on the other side of the aisle are. The Republicans are moving forward with a dangerous spending bill, one that continues to give rewards to the rich and literally guts the initiatives most meaningful to middle class families.

The work of reducing our deficit and controlling spending will be hard, to be sure. The fact of the matter is that we have to cut spending and we have to be serious about it, but we have to do it responsibly. We cannot cut what makes us competitive and what helps us to innovate, succeed in the global economy, and ultimately create jobs.

I know that the priorities that we have set are the priorities of getting people back to work. My friends, we owe it to the hardworking people of our Nation who are struggling to get by, who are playing by the rules but just waiting for someone to stand up for them rather than stand up for the rich guy on Wall Street. We owe it to America's hardworking people to have a serious and thoughtful debate with the hopes of producing a smart and sensible budget for our country. And that's why it's critical we ask our Republican friends: Just what are your priorities? Do we have the courage to stand with our country's greatest assets, our hardworking people? Or do we stand with the people who have enjoyed the most at the expense of everyone else?

America's future depends on harnessing the innovation, education, and entrepreneurship of our fellow Americans. This budget proposal undermines that opportunity, endangers our recovery, and makes our future less certain.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

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

Mr. DICKS. Madam 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 Arizona will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Army Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $2,840,427,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Navy Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $1,344,264,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Marine Corps Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $275,484,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Air Force Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $3,291,027,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Army National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; hire of passenger motor vehicles; personnel services in the National Guard Bureau; travel expenses (other than mileage), as authorized by law for Army personnel on active duty, for Army National Guard division, regimental, and battalion commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; supplying and equipping the Army National Guard as authorized by law; and expenses of repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment (including aircraft), $6,454,624,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Air National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; transportation of things, hire of passenger motor vehicles; supplying and equipping the Air National Guard, as authorized by law; expenses for repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment, including those furnished from stocks under the control of agencies of the Department of Defense; travel expenses (other than mileage) on the same basis as authorized by law for Air National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, for Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau, $5,963,839,000.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

For salaries and expenses necessary for the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, $14,068,000, of which not to exceed $5,000 may be used for official representation purposes.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, $464,581,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Army, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Navy, $304,867,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Navy, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Navy, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Air Force, $502,653,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the

Air Force shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Air Force, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Air Force, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of Defense, $10,744,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of Defense, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of Defense, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, $316,546,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris at sites formerly used by the Department of Defense, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID

For expenses relating to the Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid programs of the Department of Defense (consisting of the programs provided under sections 401, 402, 404, 407, 2557, and 2561 of title 10, United States Code), $108,032,000, to remain available until September 30, 2012.

COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ACCOUNT

For assistance to the republics of the former Soviet Union and, with appropriate authorization by the Department of Defense and Department of State, to countries outside of the former Soviet Union, including assistance provided by contract or by grants, for facilitating the elimination and the safe and secure transportation and storage of nuclear, chemical and other weapons; for establishing programs to prevent the proliferation of weapons, weapons components, and weapon-related technology and expertise; for programs relating to the training and support of defense and military personnel for demilitarization and protection of weapons, weapons components and weapons technology and expertise, and for defense and military contacts, $522,512,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That of the amounts provided under this heading, not less than $13,500,000 shall be available only to support the dismantling and disposal of nuclear submarines, submarine reactor components, and security enhancements for transport and storage of nuclear warheads in the Russian Far East and North.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND

For the Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund, $217,561,000.

□ 1740

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Chair, I will not use 5 minutes.

The United States imports over 60 percent of all the oil we consume, most of which is used for vehicles. OPEC alone exports 2 billion barrels per year to the United States. At a cost of $90 per barrel, approximate current price, this represents a $180 billion tax that our oil dependence imposes on American consumers.

Some OPEC countries that profit from our oil dependence are listed by the State Department as sponsors of terrorism, Madam Chairman. Fortunately, we're using Clean Air Act amendments to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. In April, automakers joined auto workers and President Obama to announce a landmark fuel efficiency standard that will improve auto efficiency 30 percent by 2016. These standards will save Americans $3,000 per vehicle for each car purchased in 2016 or later and reduce our oil dependence by 77 billion gallons over the life of the vehicles produced between 2012 and 2016. This efficiency improvement will keep $9.9 billion from being sent to OPEC countries.

In section 1746 of this continuing resolution, the Republicans have proposed cutting off funding for implementation of the Clean Air Act, which is the law that has made these vehicle efficiency investments possible. Americans cannot afford, Madam Chairman, to send more money to Libya and Iran.

I urge my colleagues to reject this attack on the Clean Air Act.

I yield back.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $5,254,791,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,570,108,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,461,086,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,847,066,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of vehicles, including tactical, support, and non-tracked combat vehicles; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; communications

and electronic equipment; other support equipment; spare parts, ordnance, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $8,145,665,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That of the funds made available in this paragraph, $15,000,000 shall be made available to procure equipment, not otherwise provided for, and may be transferred to other procurement accounts available to the Department of the Army, and that funds so transferred shall be available for the same purposes and the same time period as the account to which transferred.

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

Mr. POMPEO. 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 22, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,000,000)''.

Page 22, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,000,000)''.

Page 27, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,000,000)''.

Page 27, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,000,000)''.

Page 31, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,000,000)''.

Page 31, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,000,000)''.

Page 32, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,000,000)''.

Page 32, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $105,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $105,000,000)''.

Page 34, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $105,000,000)''.

Page 34, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $124,200,000)''.

Page 34, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,200,000)''.

Page 34, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,200,000)''.

Page 359, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $502,400,000)''.

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

Mr. POMPEO. Madam Chairman, let me begin by thanking Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member DICKS for the hard work that they did on the Defense appropriations bill. It was yeoman's work in difficult and challenging fiscal times to present a defense budget that makes sense for America. And there is no one who's come to Congress as a Member of this new freshman class who believes more strongly in making sure we have a strong national defense. It's for that reason that I move to reduce spending in that budget by $502 million with the amendment that I am proposing. This $502 million is spread among various procurement and research and innovation programs, and it is money that was not requested by the Department of Defense. This $502 million could certainly go to some program that they had asked for, but it's in a place that used to be reserved for earmarks. There is no particular program to which this $502 million is attributed. It goes assertedly for innovation. But we all know that innovation occurs in the private sector. And that's what this new majority is about. It's wrong to add $500 million to our deficit for a series of programs with no particular purpose except for the needs of businesses that once survived on those very earmarks.

And so, while I am very pleased with the fact that this piece of legislation has removed earmarks and has moved us towards a great deal more transparency, I would urge my fellow Members to vote for this amendment so that we can continue to get rid of the very vestiges of earmarks that voters asked us to get rid of.

I yield back.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The amendment sounds good. But unlike the Flake amendment, which sounded good, and we'll learn more about it, that was a small amount of money. This is a half a billion dollars.

A lot of people are of the opinion that government has the answer to everything. Government doesn't even have the questions to everything, let alone the answers.

And how many people in this Chamber have any idea how much technology our warfighters are using today? Whether it's on the battlefield or whether it's in training, whatever it might be, how many people know how much was created by small business or large business?

American industry produces good ideas most of the time. And much of what we see on the battlefield today and in the Armed Services came about because of innovations from small business and big business. Who knows?

If somebody can tell me how much of those great systems that we create for our soldiers, how much of that came from innovation, how much of it came from the government, then I might change my mind.

But we don't know today. You give the committee an opportunity, we'll find out. We'll find out how much this innovative, the SBIR, how much it provides compared to industry, large and small. But today we don't know the answer. And for a half a billion dollars, we need to know the answer.

So I don't object to the gentleman offering the amendment, really. But I do object to the gentleman's amendment because we don't know what the effect of it would be. We'd like to find out, and we think we owe it to the Members of this House who are responsible for the national defense to find out for them.

I yield back.

Mr. DICKS. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in very strong opposition to this amendment. The amendment deletes $60 million from procurement and $502.4 million from research and development. The sum of this funding is for innovative research and procurement from small businesses and unsolicited proposals.

And the gentleman from Florida and myself, and the gentleman from California, we've been here a long time. We have seen time after time when weapon systems like Predator and ScanEagle, I mean, there's all kinds of things that have happened because of small businesses. And when we made a decision to cut out earmarks for for-profit companies, one of the things that our committee did on a bipartisan basis, with unanimity on both sides, was to say let's put some more money into this competitive program, the Small Business Innovation and Research Program, which is at NIH, and at a number of agencies, I think DOE has one. This is a way to bring small businesses into the Defense Department on a competitive basis. And they do things that the Department needs to have done.

So I rise with my chairman, Mr. YOUNG, in strong opposition to this amendment. This was done to try to help the small business sector still make the contribution in the future for innovative new defense technologies. It's a good program and one that we should support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FLAKE. I won't take the 5 minutes. I just want to rise in strong support of this amendment. The gentleman is right; this was not asked for by the Department of Defense. And if we could save a half billion dollars, money that will not affect the war or the warfighter—but we see these kind of programs all the time. And it's more a way to generate economic activity than actually respond to any need. It assumes that the private sector out there, and small businesses aren't innovating on their own unless we ask them to do it.

□ 1750

Unless we specifically direct them or provide money for them to do it, they won't do it at all. That's just a false assumption.

So I commend the gentleman for bringing the amendment to the floor.

I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. POMPEO. Madam Chair, I would just like to add that I came from that very sector, small business. Until 45 days ago, I was running one, and I understand how small business works.

What we don't need is government taking our money and handing it back to folks. What we need is to be left alone. We need smaller government. That's my core problem with the legislation for SBIRs. Government doesn't do a very good job of picking out which of those small businesses will be successful and which piece of technology will prove to be the one that will be good for our warfighters.

If it will shrink government, if it will reduce taxes, then those small businesses will be successful. They will provide those technologies, and they will take wonderful care of every one of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines.

Mr. FLAKE. Reclaiming my time, I just want to say, in closing, the gentleman is exactly right. Any dollar that we provide in this program has to be taken from a small business or an individual through taxes. That is money that they can't use to innovate on their own. And to actually go out and to respond to an RFP or to respond to needs of the Defense Department or to contract with them, they can do that without us having the specific program for them. So I urge support for the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I welcome this amendment.

I am struck when I hear some of my colleagues on the more conservative side, although this is not uniformly them, some on the conservative side are offering this amendment. We have this interesting dichotomy about whether or not the Federal Government can ever create jobs. In general, the conservative view is the Federal Government never creates jobs. In the military area, somehow there's an exception.

We are told here that there is a constructive relationship that can exist between small businesses and the military that we are told doesn't exist elsewhere; but the major reason for cutting this is we are, at this point, overextended militarily.

Of course, there is unanimity here that we want Americans to be the strongest Nation in the world. We are of course the strongest Nation in the world, and no one is second. We are overcommitted in a number of areas.

The military has become not the instrument of self-defense by the United States, but the instrument to protecting political influence, and protecting influence militarily is often inefficient so that reducing this spending, as reducing other forms of military spending, is essential if we are to begin to hold down the deficit.

Now, I am going to be talking tomorrow, and we're only talking in military terms of half a billion dollars. In terms of the defense budget, that appears to be relatively small, but it is more than enough than would be needed to fund the Security and Exchange Commission and the Commodities Futures Trading Commission at the full level they need to regulate derivatives and hedge funds.

We have a massive disproportion in which we overspend militarily far beyond what is needed to protect ourselves. Our military budget is the largest foreign aid program in the history of the world. It exists to provide subsidies to our wealthier allies who face no threat. And to the extent that we can reduce that, particularly in an area where the Defense Department itself did not even ask for the funds, we curb unnecessary spending.

As I said, tomorrow I will be offering an amendment to try to give the Securities and Exchange Commission the ability to regulate hedge funds, or at least to keep track of them. We will be trying to offer funding to protect consumers from credit card abuse and trying to provide funding to regulate derivatives.

Taken together, those three agencies are being cut by an amount smaller than one-half billion, and we will be told that we can't afford that. So I welcome the gentleman pointing out the inconsistency between those who say that the private sector should be left to its own and the public sector does not become the job creator here in this way, and I welcome also the chance to begin, as I will be supporting the amendment of the gentleman of Arizona, this massive disproportion in which we overspend militarily. And I say ''overspend,'' because it is far beyond what is needed for the legitimate defense of the United States. It has become a form of staking our political interests, and it comes at very great cost to virtually everything else we want to do, as well as constraining the deficit reduction.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. MORAN. I rise in opposition to this amendment, in support of what the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee has said as well as Chairman YOUNG both of whom have substantial years of experience behind them.

Now, what Mr. FRANK has suggested has merit, but to support this amendment is a non sequitur to that argument. As for the gentleman from Arizona, at least he is consistent. As for the gentleman offering the amendment, well, let me try to explain why it is counterproductive. It defines the phrase ''penny wise and pound foolish.''

In fact, where we have made our greatest strides within the defense budget is in small business innovation. There are half a dozen very large defense contractors. They serve our country well. They take good ideas, they hire people, they develop them, they achieve major procurement contracts with the Defense Department. But, for the most part, they don't come up with the innovations. It's the small businesses throughout the country, that more often than not, come up with those innovations.

For example, the predator drone that has been the most successful weapon in Afghanistan was an earmark for small businesses with an innovative idea. An idea, incidentally, that was initially opposed by the Defense Dept. Much of our IED success in saving lives has come from small businesses.

Much of the simulation training that we provide our troops so they don't have to put their lives at risk, but rather can achieve the kind of training that gives them the skill set to represent us with such courage and effectiveness on the battlefield, that comes from small business innovation.

And what we are trying to do now is to put a relatively small sum of money together so that thousands of small businesses throughout the country can compete for those small grants.

Now, the fact is, as much as I respect the defense contractors, it is not necessarily in their interests to innovate, to come up with cost-cutting efficiencies, because it means that you have to reduce personnel and contract costs. Oftentimes, it exposes the fact that we're paying more than we need to for innovative approaches to securing our country. It is the small businesses of this country that really provide the ability for us to find the highest level of efficiency and effectiveness within our Defense Department.

For half a billion dollars, we will find more ways to save thousands of lives and we know we will save tens of billions of dollars in the long run. That's what this program is all about. It's a departure from the way we have done things. It's all about saving money, not relying upon Big Business or Big Government, but letting small businesses flourish who otherwise couldn't get the capital, wouldn't have the investors, couldn't pull the personnel together and pay them long enough to be able to adequately develop the potential of a great idea.

So this small pool of innovative research money will fund great ideas, ideas that make our troops safer, that enable us to let our dollars go further, and in fact enable our Nation to be far more secure. This is just the kind of program we ought to be funding more of in the Defense Department. That's why I would strongly urge defeat of this amendment.

□ 1800

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

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

Mr. DICKS. 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 Kansas will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $16,170,868,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Chair, I rise today to introduce my amendment to cut funding for the V–22, a hybrid helicopter/airplane that was in development for more than 25 years, cost the lives of 30 individuals before it ever saw combat, and still does not meet operational requirements in Iraq. Cost overruns have plagued the V–22 since its development. Initial estimates projected $40 million per plane. But today it has exploded to $120 million per plane—a threefold increase. This amendment would save $415 million for the remainder of fiscal year 2011 by cutting funding for the V–22 from the Air Force and Navy's aircraft procurement accounts.

In 2009, the GAO found that the Marine Corps received 105 V–22s. Of those, fewer than half—only 47—were considered combat deployable. But on any given day, there are an estimated 22—fewer than one in four—ready for any combat. This is largely due to unreliable parts and maintenance challenges. It was reported that 13 of the V–22's parts lasted only 30 percent of their life expectancy and six lasted less than 10 percent. In addition, the GAO found that the V–22 did not have weather radar and its ice protection system was unreliable. Not me. GAO. So that flying through icy conditions is prohibited on this plane. Can't do it. Icy conditions are often found in Afghanistan. Oddly enough, the V–22 also had problems in dusty conditions, which, coincidentally, also exist and is common in Afghanistan.

So I ask my colleagues, why do we continue to fund this boondoggle? The majority claims to have made some tough choices in this bill. Apparently this includes continuing to fund a plane that Dick Cheney called, a, quote, turkey and tried to kill four times when he was Secretary of Defense. It should also be noted that Dick Cheney did not often meet a defense program he didn't like, so this should be very telling to everyone here. In order to continue funding this plane, this Congress proposes steep cuts to be made on the backs of the most vulnerable citizens.

H.R. 1 puts the safety of American families at risk. The bill eliminates COPS hiring, a program that will put 1,330 fewer cops on our streets. The bill cuts the SAFER program, which means there are 2,400 fewer firefighters protecting our communities; so that we can build a plane that can't fly under icy conditions, can't fly when there's sand, and one out of four is ever used at any given time?

The majority has made the shortsighted choice to cut $1.3 billion from community health centers which, according to the CEO of the National Association of Community Health Centers, is equivalent to terminating health care to the entire population of Chicago, or to everyone living in the States of Wyoming, Vermont, North and South Dakota and Alaska combined. Why? For a plane that cannot fly when it's icy, which cannot fly when it's dusty. And where are we at? In a combat situation where we need it to do both things.

Look. If this weren't enough, the bill also eliminates title X funding which provides services for cancer screenings, annual exams, STD testing and contraceptives.

H.R. 1 would also cut $5 billion from Federal Pell Grants. In Illinois, this will reduce financial aid to 61,000 poor students. And as I had suggested earlier here today, maybe as Members of Congress, maybe because we are in the top 1 percent of wage earners in the United States of America, people of America understand we make $175,000, each and every one of us, and there are over 150 millionaires in this body, maybe we don't care. Maybe you can cut the Pell Grant program because you don't care whether kids get ahead and are able to go to college. But some of us should, especially those of us that have been blessed with the riches of wealth in this Nation and allowed to be able to serve in this body.

And so I simply say, Let the kids go to school. Let there be health care for the most vulnerable of Americans. And all we will be missing is this boondoggle of a hybrid helicopter that does not serve the purpose for which it was proposed.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and to speak in opposition to the amendment that was just proposed by the gentleman from Illinois.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Do we have an amendment before the House at the present time?

The Acting CHAIR. We do not.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEHAN. I appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of this very, very significant and important piece of military hardware, the V–22 Osprey. Notwithstanding the discussion in which the GAO has made a report, the fact of the matter is this is an instrument which has proven itself in the theater of war. Those who have been the most significant advocates for this very, very important airplane have been those who have used it in the theater of war, the United States Marine Corps. This has been used successfully in 14 different deployments, most recently in Iraq and Afghanistan, and has proven itself time and time again; proven itself to have the flexibility to be able to accommodate the new challenge that the Marines are facing in these dramatically challenging circumstances; the functionality to be able to respond quickly to moving troops, not just to insert most effectively in a time fashion but to be also able to get there as quickly as possible, in real-world combat situations that are changing as we speak.

Day and night raids. This is the instrument that the Air Force, Special Forces, and the Marines have identified as among the most important; the instrument that rushes to the front and medevacs the soldiers. I just visited Walter Reed just about a month ago, and the ability to get soldiers who are injured from the front lines back to the United States in time is remarkable. This is one of those instruments that allows them to do it. It's a technology which has been proven, not just in the battlefield but has also been proven by its performance. They have worked out the kinks. They have paid for it. This is the thing that the Marine Corps is asking for that's consistently within the boundaries of the existing defense budget. The soldiers on the front line are asking for the V–22 Osprey because it helps them do their job. We must stand in support of the soldiers who are doing the work defending our Nation most effectively. They are the ones who are proving that it works.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. GUTIERREZ

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 23, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $21,985,000)''.

Page 28, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $393,098,000)''.

Page 359, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $415,083,000)''.

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I have already used my 5 minutes prior, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

□ 1810

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Gutierrez amendment.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois would do an across-the-board general reduction to the aircraft procurement accounts for the Navy and the Air Force. The total reduction at $405.1 million would be transferred to the spending reduction account.

Let me just say, he spoke to the V–22 aircraft that the United States Marine Corps uses today in Iraq and Afghanistan. Let me tell you, as a former infantry officer in the United States Marine Corps, I can't speak highly enough of the V–22 aircraft.

There is no replacement right now if that aircraft were suspended in service. The CH–46 aircraft was put in the fleet in 1964 and retired in 2004, and the CH–53, I believe, in 1966. These old air frames are retiring. They need to be replaced. The V–22 is an effective aircraft, serving our Marines in the field in places like Afghanistan and Iraq with the kind of effort that our troops deserve.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. The amendment would remove $415 million total from Navy and Air Force procurement accounts. This funding would reduce the number of V–22 Ospreys from the DOD portion of the bill. The Osprey has proven itself under combat conditions to be safe, effective, survivable, and maintainable and is meeting all operational taskings. I have actually flown on the Osprey and I feel it is a very safe airplane. Today, flight-hours are increasing rapidly and will exceed 100,000 flight-hours in the first quarter of calendar year 2011. Forty-six percent of these hours have been flown in the last 2 years.

The first combat deployment was September 2007. From that time to the present, the V–22 has been in the following deployments: three deployments in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, three deployments in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, and three Marine Expeditionary Unit deployments.

The Marine Corps has procured nearly two-thirds of the required fleet of aircraft, 250 out of a total of 360. The program is currently in the 4th year of a 5-year multiyear procurement, and we only give multiyear procurements on programs that we think are highly stable.

This is a proven aircraft, and I urge rejection of this amendment.

This is an important program, one that the Special Forces are going to use, and I think we have to be very careful. For the Marine Corps, this is one of their essential programs that they have strongly supported for many, many years, and it would be a devastating blow to them not to finish this procurement.

I yield back my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Some of our Members have made some very eloquent statements why this is not a good amendment, so I am going to be very brief and just say very simply, this amendment could possibly have a serious adverse effect on the soldiers and the Marines who are operating in and around the mountains of Afghanistan who need what the V–22 can provide them. If it is not available, if it is not there, they could be in serious trouble.

So this is not a good amendment, and I don't think we should support it in any way.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment introduced by my colleague from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ). If we are truly serious about reducing our long-term deficits, we must look at the whole picture, a picture that includes defense. There can be no sacred cows or pork.

Today, defense spending, including security-related programs, comprises almost 20 percent of Federal spending, yet it is the only part of this budget that is exempt from the tough cuts facing all other Departments.

The Osprey is one of the most egregious examples of waste in the defense budget, yet DOD continues to request this costly, ineffective machine. And with due respect, the only threat this amendment poses if it doesn't pass, it could kill our own troops. Even worse, Congress continues to fund it.

The Osprey was originally created to allow Marines to carry troops and cargo faster, higher and farther than a traditional helicopter. Now the Osprey is 186 percent over budget, costs $100 million per unit to produce, it is not suited to fly safely in extreme heat, excessive sand or under fire, and, sadly, this aircraft has killed 30 Marines in accidents.

The Government Accountability Office recommended DOD reconsider procurement of the Osprey, and experts argue a helicopter could achieve many of the objectives of the Osprey at a much lower cost. Let's show our constituents we are serious about cutting the deficit by looking at all parts of the budget. Waste is waste; bloat is bloat. The fact that it comes under the Department of Defense doesn't change anything.

I urge adoption of this amendment because eliminating funding for procurement of a costly, inefficient and over-budget V–22 Osprey will prove to our constituents that we are serious about reducing spending. It will help realign our military strategy to meet today's needs, and it will save the taxpayers $415 million this year alone.

I yield back.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I can understand why our colleagues from Illinois have offered this amendment. Assertions recently surfaced about the inability of the Osprey to operate in hot conditions, high altitudes or from U.S. Navy ships. But the fact is that these charges have been disproven repeatedly in daily operations. The fact is that the Osprey provides unparalleled flexibility for Marines and Air Force Special Forces in combat operations.

We have had 14 fully successful deployments to date. No aircraft in the U.S. inventory has been subjected to as extensive a series of live-fire testing as the V–22. It is the most survivable rotorcraft ever built for the Marine Corps and Air Force. When the enemy has been able to hit the V–22, the aircraft has absorbed the damage and returned to base without injuries to passengers or crew on every single occasion.

Many of the initial readiness challenges stem from deploying the aircraft into combat before a supply chain and depot maintenance infrastructure was adequately in place. The reason it cost more was that the Special Forces felt they needed to bring it into combat operation immediately because it was such a successful rotorcraft. They needed it for the safety and effectiveness of our troops.

The fact is that major studies from both government and industry have shown that the V–22 is more operationally effective and cost efficient than any helicopter alternative. It requires fewer aircraft, fewer personnel and support than conventional rotorcraft. That results in a reduced footprint and, what we all need to be concerned about, particularly in this context, a lower total life-cycle costs.

For that reason, I think that we ought to reject this amendment and enable the Defense Department to choose its own priorities for cost cutting, and certainly Secretary Gates is in the process of doing that.

I yield back.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. 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 Illinois will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, torpedoes, other weapons, and related support equipment including spare parts, and accessories therefor; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $3,221,957,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $790,527,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels as authorized by law, including armor and armament thereof, plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; procurement of critical, long lead time components and designs for vessels to be constructed or converted in the future; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, as follows:

Carrier Replacement Program, $1,721,969,000;

Carrier Replacement Program (AP), $908,313,000;

NSSN, $3,430,343,000;

NSSN (AP), $1,691,236,000;

CVN Refueling, $1,248,999,000;

CVN Refuelings (AP), $408,037,000;

DDG–1000 Program, $77,512,000;

DDG–51 Destroyer, $2,868,454,000;

DDG–51 Destroyer (AP), $47,984,000;

Littoral Combat Ship, $1,168,984,000;

Littoral Combat Ship (AP), $190,351,000;

LHA–R, $942,837,000;

Joint High Speed Vessel, $180,703,000;

Oceanographic Ships, $88,561,000;

LCAC Service Life Extension Program, $83,035,000;

Service Craft, $13,770,000; and

For outfitting, post delivery, conversions, and first destination transportation, $295,570,000.

In all: $15,366,658,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That additional obligations may be incurred after September 30, 2015, for engineering services, tests, evaluations, and other such budgeted work that must be performed in the final stage of ship construction: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading for the construction or conversion of any naval vessel to be constructed in shipyards in the United States shall be expended in foreign facilities for the construction of major components of such vessel: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading shall be used for the construction of any naval vessel in foreign shipyards.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For procurement, production, and modernization of support equipment and materials not otherwise provided for, Navy ordnance (except ordnance for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for conversion); the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and the purchase of seven vehicles required for physical security of personnel, notwithstanding price limitations applicable to passenger vehicles but not to exceed $250,000 per vehicle; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $5,804,963,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That of the funds made available in this paragraph, $15,000,000 shall be made available to procure equipment, not otherwise provided for, and may be transferred to other procurement accounts available to the Department of the Navy, and that funds so transferred shall be available for the same purposes and the same time period as the account to which transferred.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For expenses necessary for the procurement, manufacture, and modification of missiles, armament, military equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; vehicles for the Marine Corps, including the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, $1,236,436,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of aircraft and equipment, including armor and armament, specialized ground handling equipment, and training devices, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, $13,483,739,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided in this Act for modification of C–17 aircraft, Global Hawk Unmanned Aerial Vehicle and F–22 aircraft may be obligated until all C–17, Global Hawk and F–22 contracts funded with prior year ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'' appropriated funds are definitized unless the Secretary of the Air Force certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that each such obligation is necessary to meet the needs of a warfighting requirement or prevents increased costs to the taxpayer, and provides the reasons for failing to definitize the prior year contracts along with the prospective contract definitization schedule: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Air Force shall expand the current HH–60 Operational Loss Replacement program to meet the approved HH–60 Recapitalization program requirements.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of missiles, spacecraft, rockets, and related equipment, including spare parts and accessories therefor, ground handling equipment, and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, $5,424,764,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $731,487,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For procurement and modification of equipment (including ground guidance and electronic control equipment, and ground electronic and communication equipment), and supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and the purchase of two vehicles required for physical security of personnel, notwithstanding price limitations applicable to passenger vehicles but not to exceed $250,000 per vehicle; lease of passenger motor vehicles; and expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon, prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $17,568,091,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That of the funds made available in this paragraph, $15,000,000 shall be made available to procure equipment, not otherwise provided for, and may be transferred to other procurement accounts available to the Department of the Air Force, and that funds so transferred shall be available for the same purposes and the same time period as the account to which transferred.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the

military departments) necessary for procurement, production, and modification of equipment, supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expansion of public and private plants, equipment, and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $4,009,321,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013: *Provided,* That of the funds made available in this paragraph, $15,000,000 shall be made available to procure equipment, not otherwise provided for, and may be transferred to other procurement accounts available to the Department of Defense, and that funds so transferred shall be available for the same purposes and the same time period as the account to which transferred.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES

For activities by the Department of Defense pursuant to sections 108, 301, 302, and 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2078, 2091, 2092, and 2093), $34,346,000, to remain available until expended.

□ 1820

AMENDMENT NO. 86 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 32, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,200,000)''.

Page 33, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $36,320,000)''.

Page 33, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $40,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,000,000)''.

Page 34, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $32,000,000)''.

Page 359, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $115,520,000)''.

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to amend the Defense appropriations bill by cutting $115 million of additional funding. This $115 million is aimed at alternative energy inside the Defense Department appropriations budget. I will assure you that with the President having advocated in his budget for billions of dollars of alternative energy research, development, and other types of research, that we don't need $115 million of that in our Department of Defense budget.

This funding is wasteful, it's duplicative, and won't help our soldiers. It's in five different parts of the appropriations legislation in small amounts, and this is new money. It's above and beyond that which the President had requested.

We are not underfunding alternative energy research. Just this week, the Rand Corporation came out with a study talking about alternative energy research in the defense budget and they concluded it was not helping our soldiers, our sailors, our airmen, and our fighters.

So I would urge support of this amendment reducing by $115 million the deficit that our Nation faces.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The Defense Subcommittee has spent much time over the past 2 years looking into the effects of the services—all the services—to reduce their dependence on fossil fuel. The Department of Defense, which consumes 93 percent of all the fuel consumed by the U.S. Government, has made significant strides in reducing its consumption, but the associated logistics of moving fuel for vehicles, aircraft, forward operating bases remain massive and costly. It has also been shown that for every 24 fuel convoys in Afghanistan, an American soldier is wounded or killed.

The Defense Subcommittee has made a conscious and dedicated effort to advance the Department's efforts, searching for better ways to reduce consumption and alleviate the costly and complicated logistics. This amendment, however, would unnecessarily erase that progress and further the Department's dependence on fossil fuels. For this, and many other reasons, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. The amendment cuts $115.5 million in funding for development of alternative energy. The bill includes funding based in part on the Defense Science Board's February 2008 report on DOD energy strategy. The DSB report made numerous recommendations to improve DOD energy efficiency. In addition, the committee held a formal briefing with officials from the Military Services, the Defense Logistic Agency, and OSD to review energy efficiency and energy technology programs.

DOD is the largest single consumer of energy in the United States. In 2006, it spent $13.6 billion to buy 110 million barrels of petroleum fuel—about 300,000 barrels of oil each day—and 3.8 billion kilowatt hours of electricity. This represents about eight-tenths of 1 percent of total U.S. energy consumption and 78 percent of energy consumption by the Federal Government.

In combat operations such as Iraq and Afghanistan, moving fuel to deployed forces has proven to be a high-risk operation. Reducing operational fuel demand is the single best means to reduce that risk. However, the Defense Science Board concluded that DOD is not currently equipped to make decision on the most effective way to do so.

The DSB recommended increased investment in energy efficient and alternative energy technologies to a level commensurate with their operational and financial value. The Defense Science Board recommended that the Department of Defense invest in basic research to develop new fuel technologies that are too risky for private investments and to partner with private sector fuel users to leverage efforts and share burdens. The bill emphasizes funding these types of initiatives.

I strongly urge rejection of this amendment.

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

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I don't come here to argue that we don't have to make serious cuts and reduce our spending. I'm sure that we do—and we will. But I do find it remarkable that I stood in this place a matter of weeks ago and fought to have a small increase in taxes for millionaires that would have eased the burden that we face today, but the argument was made—and made loudly from my colleagues across the aisle—that we couldn't afford to make millionaires pay more taxes. We were talking about increasing the tax rate on amounts over $250,000 from 36 percent to 39 percent, and we were told that we could not do that.

Yet here we are today and we're talking about cutting low-income heating assistance for families in the Northeast in New England that are suffering from the worst winter in decades. We're talking about cutting WIC for single moms who are trying to raise kids. We're talking about cutting education and funds for kids.

It seems that our priorities are misplaced here. Save the tax cuts for the millionaires but cut everything for people who have nowhere else to turn. It's reverse Robin Hood. We're robbing from the poor to make sure the rich keep their tax cuts. I can't believe it. In that bill not many weeks ago—just a few weeks ago, we actually—I didn't, but those who voted for it did—cut $119 billion out of Social Security, but we kept those tax cuts for those millionaires.

With all due respect to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle from the tea party, I actually represent the city of Boston, the port of Boston. When you visit the Tea Party Memorial, that's in my district. Just for the record, I want to make sure people understand when the colonists at the tea party revolted, they threw the tea overboard. They didn't throw senior citizens overboard. They didn't throw kids overboard. They didn't throw young mothers on WIC overboard. We have a challenge before us about where our priorities are going to be going forward.

I'm proud to say that I grew up in the housing projects in south Boston. I'm not ashamed to say that we struggled

as a family when I was a kid. I'm too old to be a WIC baby; but if they had had it, I'm sure my family would have been on it. As my dad used to say, there were times in our family where we had to save up to be poor.

□ 1830

But we have a moral obligation here to get our priorities right. I hope that at some point in this process that ideology is set aside and that we really do tackle in a fair way the problems that this country faces. I've been here long enough to understand that fairness does not always carry the day in these debates.

Then you see the cuts to people who have nowhere else to turn. You see cuts to Social Security. There was $119 billion cut out of Social Security several weeks ago, and we diverted that out. I'm sure at some point we're going to hear that it's unsustainable, that Social Security is unsustainable, because we cut $119 billion out of it; but we've got seniors in this country who have nowhere else to turn. They're on fixed incomes.

We cut Social Security rather than ask millionaires to give a little bit more. I think that is not consistent with what this country is all about. I hope at some point that common sense and mutual interests on behalf of what's really important in this country do prevail in this Chamber, that ideology, both far right and far left, is tossed aside, and that we can actually get down to the business of moving this country forward.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I rise in opposition to the amendment. I strongly support the comments from the gentlemen from New Jersey and the State of Washington. In fact, they understated the case.

Mr. Chairman, the United States Department of Defense is the largest consumer of energy in the world. These, I think, ill-advised efforts to undercut important research areas have significant implications, first and foremost, for the operational activities of the Department of Defense. The Iraq war was four times more energy intense than the first gulf war given what has happened in terms of changing tactics; and, frankly, the danger to our troops was understated. Those tankers might as well have great big bull's-eyes painted on them because they were targets for terrorists, and they put our soldiers at risk; and all of us represent States that lost people because of that vulnerability. It costs over $100 a gallon to deliver this fuel to the front.

I seriously hope that people take a deep breath and listen to the counsel of the people from the committee. This is a long-term threat to our men and women in the field. It is also a long-term threat to the budget of the Department of Defense. If you plot what their energy costs have been over time, it probably rivals only the cost of health care for our troops.

I would hope that we understand the opportunities here. As my friend from the State of Washington pointed out, it is research that isn't going to happen from the private sector. This is the sort of investment that government needs to make up front. It's the same thing that led to the development of the Internet.

It will have important economic benefits going forward because this will not be exclusively the province of the Department of Defense. The extent to which these technologies work and can be brought to scale, they will be developed by private companies. It will make a difference as to how we as Americans live, because, after all, we as a country waste more energy than anybody in the world.

This is a very serious point. I deeply appreciate the wise counsel of the committee leadership, and I strongly urge that this amendment be rejected.

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

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

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

Mr. BARTLETT. Last week, there was WikiLeaks activity that pointed out a huge problem that we in the world face. WikiLeaks released some confidential emails that indicated that the Saudis had only 60 percent of the oil that they had advertised they had. I think this is probably true of most of the OPEC countries that were incentivized to exaggerate their oil reserves when they were permitted to pump a percentage of the oil reserves.

Mr. Chairman, there is almost nobody now who doesn't agree that the world reached its maximum production of conventional oil in 2006. We've been stuck now for about 5 years at 84, 85 million barrels a day of oil. Increasingly, the difference between conventional oils, which are now falling off in production, and that 84, 85 million barrels a day is that it is made up by unconventional oil, like the heavy sour of Venezuela and the tar sands of Alberta, Canada.

Our military has been very wisely pursuing a goal that the rest of us should have been involved in. Maybe they read Hyman Rickover's speech from 1957 where he noted that, in the 8,000-year recorded history of man, the age of oil would be but a blip. He didn't know then how long it would last, but he said how long it lasted was important in only one regard—the longer it lasted, the more time we would have to plan an orderly transition to other sources of energy.

Of course we have done none of that in spite of the fact that we have known for 31 years with absolute certainty that we were going to get here today, because by 1980, we were already 10 years down the other side of Hubbert's peak as predicted by M. King Hubbert in 1956.

The military has been attuned to this problem much more than any other part of our society, and they have been very wisely pursuing alternative fuels because, as we wind down on the available fossil fuels, the world will ultimately, of course, move to alternative fuels. The military has several reasons for doing this. It is a very aggressive program, a very wise program; and I think that it would just be tragic if we were to eliminate the funds for this.

They increasingly need to move to alternatives for all of those reasons; and the rest of us need to move to alternatives for an additional reason, that they now are moving to alternatives that they can produce on site to reduce the long supply trails that create so many casualties over there.

They ought to have been doing this earlier. I am delighted they're doing it now, and I think it would be a national security tragedy if we were to deny them the funds to continue doing this.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of the amendment before this one, Congressman GUTIERREZ's amendment, to reduce funding for the V–22 Osprey.

This program has been highly troubled since its inception. In fact, it was almost canceled several times. As my friend Mr. GUTIERREZ noted, former Defense Secretary Cheney actually called for its cancellation several times. During its testing, the V–22 killed 30 people; and in April 2010, a V–22 crashed in Afghanistan, killing four more people. The GAO has noted that this plane has trouble flying over 8,000 feet or in extreme heat.

You know what? There's more.

This plane has a problem carrying troops, transporting cargo, and operating off naval vessels. No wonder the Pentagon wants to cancel the program in its entirety.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WOOLSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. The Pentagon does not want to kill this program. I just want to make sure that you understand that, because this is one of the highest priorities for the Marine Corps, the Air Force and Special Operations. Most of the problems you're talking about have been taken care of.

Ms. WOOLSEY. All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That is my understanding of what the Pentagon wanted to do, but I yield to your wisdom.

I do believe that canceling the V–22 and saving $10 billion to $12 billion over 10 years would be real fiscal savings.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

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

Mr. POMPEO. 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 Kansas will be postponed.

□ 1840

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 370 by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 87 by Mr. POMPEO of Kansas.

Amendment No. 63 by Mr. GUTIERREZ of Illinois.

Amendment No. 86 by Mr. POMPEO of Kansas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 370 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 207, noes 223, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

AYES—207

Alexander
Amash
Baca
Bachmann
Baldwin
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Coble
Cohen
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dent
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Eshoo
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Flores
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves (GA)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutierrez
Hanna
Harman
Harris
Hayworth
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Inslee
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kind
Kucinich
Labrador
Landry
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Olver
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Richardson
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ross (AR)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shimkus
Shuler
Smith (NE)
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)

NOES—223

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boren
Brady (PA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
Denham
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Emerson
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maloney
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Moran
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Reed
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stivers
Sullivan
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—3

Giffords
Lewis (GA)
Waters

□ 1908

Messrs. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, ROTHMAN of New Jersey, GOSAR, Mrs. NOEM, Messrs. ROGERS of Alabama, ALTMIRE, OLSON, Ms. EDWARDS, Messrs. LATHAM, BECERRA and HINOJOSA changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. CLARKE of Michigan, CARDOZA, ROSS of Arkansas, TIERNEY, NEAL, ROGERS of Michigan, ALEXANDER, COHEN, LANDRY, FATTAH, INSLEE, CASSIDY, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SUTTON, Messrs. ENGEL, FORTENBERRY, MILLER of Florida, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. DELAURO, Messrs. ELLISON, MURPHY of Connecticut and ROKITA changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 72, noes 358, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

AYES—72

Alexander
Amash
Bass (NH)
Blackburn
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Frank (MA)
Gardner
Garrett

Gibson
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Griffith (VA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Labrador
Lummis
Mack
Marchant
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Pompeo
Quayle
Rehberg
Ribble
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Stearns
Stutzman
Upton
Walsh (IL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOES—358

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herger
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—3

Giffords
Lewis (GA)
Waters

□ 1913

Messrs. LYNCH and WEINER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. GUTIERREZ

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 105, noes 326, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 43]

AYES—105

Amash
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boswell
Braley (IA)
Campbell
Capuano
Cardoza
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Deutch
Dingell
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Heller
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Jackson (IL)
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Lee (CA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Towns
Upton
Velázquez
Walden
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—326

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boren
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cicilline
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson

Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Wasserman Schultz
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—2

Giffords
Lewis (GA)

□ 1918

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. CLEAVER, RICHMOND, and DEUTCH changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 86 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 109, noes 320, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

AYES—109

Adams
Altmire
Amash
Bachus
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Conaway
Costello
Dent
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Flake
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Hall
Harris
Hayworth
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Labrador
Landry
Lankford
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
McClintock
McKinley
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Pence
Peters
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Quayle
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rokita
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (NE)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Tipton
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—320

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Buerkle
Butterfield
Calvert
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nunnelee
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Giffords
King (IA)
Lewis (GA)
Welch

□ 1924

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 514. An act 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $9,710,998,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2012.