Accordingly, H.R. 5147 is the latest short-term extension act. It ensures continuity of funding and program authority beyond April 30, 2010, when the FAA's current extension expires. H.R. 5147 provides a two-month extension of aviation programs, through July 3, 2010.

I thank my Committee colleagues—especially Ranking Member MICA, Aviation Subcommittee Chairman COSTELLO, and Aviation Subcommittee Ranking Member PETRI—as well as Ways and Means Committee Chairman LEVIN and Ranking Member CAMP for working with me on this critical legislation.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5147.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5147.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5013, IMPLEMENTING MANAGEMENT FOR PERFORMANCE AND RELATED REFORMS TO OBTAIN VALUE IN EVERY ACQUISITION ACT OF 2010

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1300 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1300

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5013) to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for performance management of the defense acquisition system, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee. The Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina, Dr. FOXX. All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous materials into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 5013, the IMPROVE Acquisition Act of 2010. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. It makes in order the committee amendment as an original bill and provides that the bill shall be considered as read.

The rule waives all points of order against the committee amendment except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. The rule makes in order the 16 amendments printed in the Rules Committee report and waives all points of order against those amendments except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The rule provides the Chair may entertain a motion that the committee rise only if offered by the Chair of the Committee on Armed Services or a designee. The Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, over the years we have watched as countless stories revealed flaws in the military's procurement operation. Disappointment with the way the Department of Defense manages the money we appropriate it reflects poorly not just on the Pentagon, but on Congress as well. The $640 toilet seat is now the stuff of legend, but sadly it is often just the tip of the iceberg.

In recent years, excesses stemming from the ill considered rush towards privatization championed by the previous administration have become increasingly common. The push to contract out nearly every part of the military's mission has inevitably led to waste, fraud, and abuse involving some of the biggest corporate names in this country. Sadly, I believe that many years from now historians will associate a significant part of the war in Iraq with wasteful and poorly managed contracts that made private companies millions of dollars, billions of dollars, actually, often at the expense of our own men and women in uniform and certainly of taxpayers.

Two years ago in Congress, I was here on the floor as the House debated H.R. 1362, the Accountability in Contracting Act. That, too, was intended to save taxpayer money. Earlier in the 110th Congress, I worked with my friend, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, on H.R. 897, the Iraq and Afghanistan Contractor Sunshine Act. I hesitate to say that those and other efforts towards contracting reform have been unsuccessful. Clearly, we have made significant reforms and part of our work in Congress involves regular and diligent oversight. It is a never-ending process.

For my part, one of my proudest efforts during my career in Congress has been to force the Pentagon to acknowledge that some of the testing done on body armor for troops during an early part of the war was deeply flawed. My work on this issue grew out of a 2006 audit that I read about in The New York Times that found that 80 percent of marines who had died in Iraq of upper body wounds would have survived with the proper body armor. I waited for other committees to take the lead, but no one came to the floor.

We are still working on this issue, but we have come a very long way. Major changes have been made in testing labs, some of them taken back into the Army rather than contracted out, which in this case did not work. Thankfully, however, the work did accomplish one thing: the military agreed to no more poorly managed deals for outside contractors to test the body armor. All current and future body armor testing will be conducted internally by the Department of Testing and Evaluation within the DOD with strict standards to ensure our troops receive nothing but the highest quality of body armor.

When it comes to the safety of our troops, which we send into battle, it is foolish to put the bid out to the lowest-priced contractor.

But today we have moved into a new chapter of oversight and reform, and I am happy to see it come. This morning we are bringing up an important piece of legislation intended to help the Pentagon reform inefficient procurement

operations. It's called the Implementing Management for Performance and Related Reforms to Obtain Value in Every Acquisition Act of 2010, otherwise known as the IMPROVE Act. This bill will help the Defense Department immediately, once this is signed, to crack down on cost overruns and lax oversight of contractors. Not only that, but the bill should help reduce our dangerous reliance oftentimes on outside companies to do so many varied functions on behalf of the military.

It is hard to overstate how important this bill is. My colleague, Mr. CONAWAY of Texas, who is the ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee Defense Acquisition Panel, offered the following testimonial on how urgent the need is for contracting and acquisition reform. He said: ''The Department of Defense is the largest agency in the Federal Government, owning 86 percent of the government's assets, estimated at $4.6 trillion. Over the last two decades, millions of dollars have been spent by DOD in the quest to obtain auditable financial statements.'' Yet getting those numbers has proven elusive, if not at times impossible. No more, Mr. Speaker, after this bill is signed.

This bill mandates that the Pentagon consider shifting work away from contractors if they don't meet the cost goals. It will set up a new system of cost objectives and schedules which DOD procurement officers would have to follow. The bill says that by 2017 Pentagon agencies must prepare records that can be audited and draft a new policy that wouldn't reward those who don't meet requirements. These are simple, sensible reforms that the American people can understand and appreciate.

□ 1130

No matter what anyone in Congress thinks of the ongoing wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, all of us know that the men and women who are serving overseas rely on the equipment, and they deserve to know that the funds for their equipment are not being squandered and that they are given equipment of the highest quality.

Another bright note on this legislation is that, when it was approved by the Armed Services Committee, the vote was 56–0. Such bipartisanship is rare in the House these days, and I am happy to speak on a bill that all of us can agree on. Although there is not currently any pending movement on the bill in the Senate, it is my hope a decisive and strong bipartisan vote today on this bill will spur the Senate into action. Billions of taxpayer dollars and the trust of our troops depend on it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from New York for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned that the underlying bill we have before us today is being brought forward under a structured rule, adding to the record number of structured and closed rules the Democrats have arbitrarily used since they have been in the majority.

Today, the Democrats in charge have rejected nine amendments offered by their colleagues, and they have refused to allow these amendments to be debated and for their colleagues' voices to be heard. Democrats have chosen to stifle and control the debate today, presenting the Congress with another structured rule, eliminating the ability of both the Republicans and the Democrats to offer important amendments affecting their constituents.

After promising to have the most honest and open Congress in history, why has the Speaker consistently gone back on her word? Why are the Democrats in charge shutting off debate and silencing their colleagues on both sides of the aisle? Are they afraid of debate? Are they protecting their Members from tough votes?

Regardless of their motives, one thing is clear: The Democrats in charge are doing the American people an injustice by refusing to allow their Representatives to offer their amendments on the floor of the people's House. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this structured rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I need to point out to the gentlewoman that there were 26 amendments offered on this bill. Only one was a Republican amendment. Ten amendments were not allowed, but the Republican amendment was. We are not afraid of debate. We are not afraid of discussion. As a matter of fact, I am somewhat taken aback by your calling for a ''no'' vote on this rule given that this legislation passed unanimously out of the committee.

I have no further requests for time, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I appreciate the comments of the gentlewoman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I do realize that the bill passed out of committee unanimously, and I am sure it is going to receive strong support on the floor. Yet we know that providing protection for our Nation is one of the few jobs specifically assigned to the Federal Government by the U.S. Constitution. Indeed, the Federal Government is the only level of government that can provide for the defense of this Nation. However, based on the policies of this administration and the Democrats in charge, who have slashed defense spending even in the midst of ongoing terror threats, only to increase domestic spending and our national debt, you would never know this was true.

I am very concerned about the backward spending priorities of this administration and of the Democrats in charge. While the defense budget proposed by the administration is flat, growing only by 1 percent last year, automatic spending grew by $77 billion, or 5 percent. Military spending represents less than one-fifth of the Federal budget and approximately half of the average level of defense spending during the Cold War as a percentage of our economy. Meanwhile, Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and the President's new health care takeover are on course to consume the entire Federal budget, including defense. According to the Heritage Foundation, under current projections, it is expected that the Federal Government will spend more on interest payments for the national debt than on defense by the year 2015, if not sooner.

The Obama administration's recently released Nuclear Posture Review and New START agreement will weaken national security, and it will make our Nation less safe. It will cause the U.S. to fall dangerously behind at a time when other countries are seeking to strengthen and to develop their own nuclear weapons. The President seems to believe that the power of New START's example will somehow encourage Iran and North Korea to surrender their ambitions, but there is no evidence to believe this is the case. Since the end of the Cold War, these countries have only increased their attempts to gain nuclear weapons even as the U.S. and Russia have been reducing their supplies.

What would do far more good is a loud and clear declaration that the U.S. and Russia will stop Iran from gaining a nuclear military capability by whatever means necessary. The NPR references existing treaties that our enemies disregard and treaties that have yet to be negotiated, which will take years of diplomatic effort to achieve but will do little to make America more secure.

The threat to international nonproliferation is a nuclear Iran, not the U.S. nuclear arsenal. Nuclear weapons are an inevitable truth in our modern-day world, so, unfortunately, they are essential to our national survival. As long as they exist, we must have the world's most effective nuclear arsenal and possess a missile defense system to protect ourselves against any actor that employs nuclear weapons. This is necessary in order to comply with the Constitution's requirements to provide for our common defense.

The NPR signifies that the Obama administration plans to neglect this responsibility. The administration's NPR provides many carrots but few sticks. It commits the U.S. to unilateral disarmament while hoping that this will give incentives to other nations to do the same, which it will not. It leaves the U.S. with no deterrent against rogue nations, such as North Korea and Iran, which continue to develop nuclear arsenals and to assert they will use nuclear weapons if they so much as feel threatened by the U.S.

A ''nuclear zero,'' which the Obama administration talks eloquently about, cannot be achieved unilaterally or even bilaterally. It will require many countries to make the strategic decision

that nuclear weapons are unnecessary for their security. Yet the rest of the world, including our allies, friends and foes, see the continuing value in nuclear weapons.

Winston Churchill once warned the U.S. to ''be careful, above all things, not to let go of the atomic weapon until you are sure and more than sure that other means of preserving peace are in your hands.''

We are not even close to meeting Churchill's requirement, because we have not yet found an alternative basis for preventing war. Weakening our nuclear arsenal will stop us from being able to follow through on our commitments to our allies. Many of our closest allies see U.S. nuclear weapons as a large component of their security and the reason they remain nonnuclear. Without the U.S. nuclear umbrella, they may fear that they lack security and, thus, will develop their own alternative nuclear deterrent capabilities.

As the late British nuclear expert, Sir Michael Quinlan, stated, ''Better a world with nuclear weapons but no major war than one with major war but no nuclear weapons.''

Nuclear weapons have served our Nation as a primary deterrent and are the reason we have not had a world war since their inception. Without them, we will lose our ability to deter rogue nations from attacking us or our allies. Thus, we will lose the ability to lead our world towards peace.

Mr. Speaker, not so long ago, the Democrats in charge were outspoken critics of the Bush administration's spending. However, it is clear that these same Democrats either have very short memories or their criticism was all for show because, since being in charge, they have not only failed to improve our current economic situation but have undeniably made it worse. While both Republicans and Democrats need to work to hold the line on spending, it is only appropriate that the Democrats in charge be reminded of their criticisms of deficit spending under a Republican Congress, which their own spending under their Democrat Congress now dwarfs.

In 2006, then-Minority Leader PELOSI stated, ''When Republicans spend the Federal budget into the red, the U.S. Treasury borrows money from foreign countries. Our national debt is a national security issue. Countries that own our debt will not only be making our toys, our clothes, and our computers, pretty soon, they will be making our foreign policy.''

Actions speak louder than words. If only Speaker PELOSI still held these beliefs today, maybe our fiscal situation would look quite different.

Again in 2006, Minority Leader PELOSI is quoted as saying, ''If something is important to you, figure out how to pay for it, but do not make my children and grandchildren have to pay for it or anybody's children or grandchildren have to pay for it. It is immoral for us to heap these deficits on our children.''

How ironic, Mr. Speaker, to have had those words spoken by now Speaker PELOSI.

In 2006, then-Minority Whip HOYER told Republicans, ''You have voted for budgets which have provided the largest deficits in our history. You are in charge of the House; you are in charge of the Senate, and you have the Presidency.''

I would tell the majority leader today to heed his own words and to ask himself if his Democrat Congress is doing the right thing by the American people, by our children, and by our grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on both the previous question and on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPLEMENTING MANAGEMENT FOR PERFORMANCE AND RELATED REFORMS TO OBTAIN VALUE IN EVERY ACQUISITION ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1300 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. 5013.

□ 1148

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. 5013) to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for performance management of the defense acquisition system, and for other purposes, with Mr. KIND 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 Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 5013, which is known as the IMPROVE Acquisition Act of 2010. For many years we've witnessed waste in the Department of Defense's acquisition system spiral out of control, placing a heavy burden both on the American taxpayers as well as our men and women in uniform. Less frequently, but still far too often, fraud and abuse have crept into the system, as sadly it happened recently in Iraq. Our troops rely on the acquisition system to buy the equipment they need to keep them safe on the battlefield as well as to protect our country. And when that system breaks down, they suffer.

In recent years, I and many of my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee have become increasingly concerned that this flawed defense acquisition system was not responsive enough to today's mission needs, not rigorous enough in protecting the tax dollars of millions of families who are struggling financially, and not disciplined enough in the acquisition of weapons systems for tomorrow's wars.

We took action. Mr. Chairman, last year we worked with the Senate to enact legislation to reform weapons system acquisition, which covers about 20 percent of all of the military acquisitions. However, weapon systems make up only a small piece of our defense. That bill was a great launching pad; however, we need to do more.

In the House, we continued the effort by creating a Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform, ably led by Congressmen ROB ANDREWS and MIKE CONAWAY to carry out a comprehensive review of the current system and to identify what steps we need to take to make this system work. The panel could not have done a better job scrutinizing the defense acquisition system. It deals with everything from paper clips to boots to food, everything under the acquisition umbrella.

During the course of this past year, this panel held 14 hearings plus two briefings on a broad range of issues dealing with the acquisition system, unearthing everything from contract fraud to simple process errors that led to billions of wasted dollars. They put together an excellent report with suggestions to fix the system. And we are here today, with the good will of the House, to pass legislation that will enact those recommendations as outlined in the panel headed by Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. CONAWAY.

This act will overhaul the defense acquisition system in many respects. Basically, however, requiring the department to set clear objectives for the defense acquisition system and manage performance in achieving those objectives; requiring the department to introduce real accountability into the requirements process, and create a requirements process for the acquisition of services; strengthening and revitalizing the acquisition workforce; requiring the department to develop meaningful consequences for success or failure in financial management; and strengthening the industrial base to enhance competition and gain access to more innovative technology.

In other words, the legislation before us today would require the Department of Defense to adopt the basic management practices that are necessary for anything as complex as the acquisitions system to function properly. These changes will make sure that the men and women who are risking their lives to protect our country are getting