United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 2011 No. 35

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 9, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VIRGINIA FOXX to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Of late, signs of spring speak of new life, O Lord. May the first gasps of freedom stabilize the Earth with fresh beauty. May heroic hearts of leadership the world over burst forth with psalms of thanksgiving for Your saving grace and goodness.

Hopefully, Lord, our spring fasting and renewal in prayer will peel away illusions for the Nation and personal self-deception. May rage, violence and anger be drowned out by gentle rains as, with common endeavor, we work for the uprooting of weeds and the planting of new seed.

Let destructive forces be silenced by constructive ideas and collaborative efforts. By Your Spirit, Lord, renew the face of the Earth.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WOMACK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 23. An act to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for patent reform.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 85–874, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, reappoints the following individuals to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts:

The Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD).

The Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106–567, the Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, reappoints, the following individual to serve as a member of the Public Interest Declassification Board:

Sanford Ungar of Maryland.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After consultation among the Speaker and the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent, the Chair announces that, when the two Houses meet in joint meeting to hear an address by The Honorable Julia Gillard, Prime Minister of Australia, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those immediately to his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House. Due to the large attendance that is anticipated, the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly enforced. Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor. The cooperation of all Members is requested.

The practice of reserving seats prior to the joint meeting by placard will not be allowed. Members may reserve their seats by physical presence only following the security sweep of the Chamber.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, February 28, 2011, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

During the recess, beginning at 10:50 a.m., the following proceedings were had:

JOINT MEETING TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JULIA GILLARD, PRIME MINISTER OF AUSTRALIA

The Speaker of the House presided.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms, Mrs. Kerri Hanley, announced the President pro tempore and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore taking the chair at the left of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort The Honorable Julia Gillard, Prime Minister of Australia, into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR);

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING);

The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER);

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN);

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON);

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY);

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI);

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER);

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN);

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON);

The gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA);

The gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN);

The gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA);

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY); and

The gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The President pro tempore of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort The Honorable Julia Gillard, Prime Minister of Australia, into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID);

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN);

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY);

The Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER);

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL);

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER);

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO); and

The Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR).

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms announced the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, Her Excellency Heng Chee Chan, Ambassador of the Republic of Singapore.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for her.

At 11 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m., the Deputy Sergeant at Arms announced The Honorable Julia Gillard, Prime Minister of Australia.

The Prime Minister of Australia, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The SPEAKER. Members of Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you The Honorable Julia Gillard, Prime Minister of Australia.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

Prime Minister GILLARD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President Pro Tempore, distinguished Members of the Senate and the House, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am the fourth Australian Prime Minister to address you. Like them, I take your invitation as a great honor. Like them, I accept it on behalf of Australia.

Since 1950, Australian Prime Ministers Robert Menzies, Bob Hawke and John Howard have come here, speaking for all the Australian people, through you, to all the people of the United States. They each came with a simple message, a message which has been true in war and peace, a message which has been true in hardship and prosperity, in the Cold War and in the new world, a message I repeat to you today:

Distinguished Members of the Senate and the House, you have a true friend down under.

For my parents' generation, the defining image of America was the landing at Normandy . . . your ''boys of Point-du-Hoc'' risking everything to help free the world. For my own generation, the defining image of America was the landing on the Moon. My classmates and I were sent home from school to watch the great moment on television. I'll always remember thinking that day:

Americans can do anything.

Americans helped free the world of my parents' generation. Americans inspired the world of my own youth.

I stand here, and I see before me the very same brave and free people. I believe you can do anything still. There is a reason the world always looks to America: Your great dream—life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—inspires us all.

Those of you who have spent time with Australians know that we are not given to overstatement. By nature, we are laconic speakers, and by conviction, we are realistic thinkers. In both of our countries, real mates talk straight. We mean what we say, so let me say this to you:

You have an ally in Australia—an ally for war and peace, an ally for hardship and prosperity, an ally for the 60 years past—and Australia is also an ally for all of the years to come. Geography and history alone could never explain the strength of the commitment between us. Rather, our values are shared and our people are friends.

This is the heart of our alliance.

This is why in our darkest days we have been glad, glad to see each other's face and hear each other's voice. Australia's darkest days in the last century followed the fall of Singapore in 1942.

And you were there with us.

Under attack in the Pacific, we fought together.

side by side . . . step by bloody step.

And whilst it was Australian soldiers at Milne Bay who gave the allies our first victory on land in the Pacific War, it was American sailors at the Battle of the Coral Sea who destroyed the fear of an invasion of Australia.

Distinguished Members of the Senate and the House, Australia does not forget. We will never forget.

The ultimate expression of our alliance, the ANZUS Treaty, was not signed until 1951, but it was anticipated a decade earlier in the judgments—the clear, frank and accurate judgments—of an Australian Prime Minister; and in the resolve—the extraordinary, immovable resolve—of an American President. In the decades since, we have stuck together in every major conflict—from Korea and Vietnam to the conflicts in the Gulf.

Your darkest days since Pearl Harbor were 10 years ago in Washington and New York.

And we were with you.

My predecessor John Howard was quite literally with you, and he came to this Capitol when you met on September 12 to show you that Australians would be with you again; and after 50 years, under a new Prime Minister and a new President, the ANZUS Treaty was invoked.

Within Australia's democracy, John Howard and I had our differences, but he was and is an Australian patriot, a man who was moved by what he saw here in that terrible September. He was and is a friend of America. When John Howard addressed you here in 2002, we were already with you in Afghanistan, and we are with you there still.

I want you to know what I told Australia's Parliament in Canberra, what I told General Petraeus in Kabul, what I told President Obama in the Oval Office this week: Australia will stand firm with our ally the United States.

Our friends understand this, that we will stand firm with you; but perhaps more importantly, our enemies understand this, too.

We must be very realistic about Afghanistan's future. Australia firmly

supports the international strategy led by President Obama and adopted in Lisbon last year. Australia is doing our part, in Uruzgan province in particular and across the whole of Afghanistan. The Government of Afghanistan must play its part, too. We know transition will take some years. We must not transition out only to transition back in.

We must not.

From my discussions with your country's leaders in Washington, my meetings with generals in Afghanistan and my time with our troops, this is my conclusion: I believe we have the right strategy in place, a resolute and courageous commander in General Petraeus, and the resources needed to deliver the strategy. I am cautiously encouraged by what I have seen.

For a moment, I want you to see Afghanistan through the eyes of Corporal Ben Roberts-Smith. Ben is Australia's most recent Victoria Cross winner—our equivalent of your Medal of Honor. Ben is a veteran of five tours of Afghanistan, and first went there in 2006. When we met recently, his words to me were compelling.

He said, ''It is not the same country I first went to 5 years ago. We are making a difference.''

Friends, there are hard days ahead.

I flew to your country the day after attending a funeral of a young Australian who served in Afghanistan. Sapper Jamie Larcombe was from my home state of South Australia, from a small community with the most perfectly Australian name . . . Kangaroo Island. Jamie's life's ambition was to serve his country. He was a long way from Kangaroo Island when he made the ultimate sacrifice.

We will remember.

I know very many young Americans have served their country and lost their lives in Afghanistan, too.

As a friend, we share your grief.

As an ally, we share your resolve.

Afghanistan must never again be a safe haven for terrorism.

Just as our security alliance is one for war and peace, our economic partnership is one for hardship and prosperity.

In hard days, we work together.

Our societies share a deep understanding of the importance of work. We believe life is given purpose and direction by work. Without work, there is corrosive aimlessness. With the loss of work comes the loss of dignity. That's why, in each of our countries, the great goal of all we do in the economy is the same . . . to ensure that everyone who can work does work.

In turn, this is why each of our countries took early and strong action in the face of the greatest threat to the world's economy since the Great Depression, and we did not just act locally or individually. We worked together when hardship came.

It was difficult, but we did it together.

New global realities and the emerging economic weight of countries like China, India and Brazil meant the vital forum for the global response was the leaders of the G20 nations. My predecessor Kevin Rudd worked hard to ensure this was so. The world needed a global response to the economic crisis, and global leadership was vital. Together, the G20 coordinated $5 trillion in fiscal stimulus for the global economy.

While there has been very real pain, the global response averted true economic disaster. Economic stimulus has been crucial—to limit the worst effects of the downturn. Economic reform is crucial now—to deliver the best hopes for a strong recovery.

Like you, I am a leader in a democracy. I know reform is never easy, but I know reform is right.

The global economic outlook remains fragile and uncertain. Global economic imbalances persist, and we must address them or risk future instability. Your leadership in the G20 is still needed to ensure we make the reforms which will keep the global economy on the path to strong, sustained and balanced growth.

And that is the path to growth in America as well.

We worked hard with you during the global economic crisis to resist protectionist pressures. This only built on our decades working together to promote free trade in the world. I know many of you worked hard to achieve the Australia-U.S. Free Trade Agreement.

May I say to each of you today, thank you.

Our FTA experience shows the benefits of free trade, and we aim for even larger benefits from the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which is a great economic opportunity for our two countries and seven of our regional partners. And we have other opportunities to promote trade and jobs together as well. I am looking forward to your country hosting the APEC Leaders' meeting later this year. We will work closely together there.

Australia is also working for an ambitious and balanced conclusion of the WTO Doha Round as soon as possible; and we look forward to your Congress passing a 2012 farm bill that advances free trade rather than distorting it, and that through free trade creates jobs.

We know the equation is simple: trade equals jobs.

A very simple equation.

Our societies share a deep understanding of the importance of work, and our societies share a deep commitment to the value of education. We understand education's transformative power. We know education is the future for every child who learns. We also know education is the future for our economies. Our future growth relies on competitiveness and innovation, skills and productivity; and these, in turn, rely on the education of our people.

Australia and America are partners in a globalized world where open societies flourish and competitive economies thrive. That's why I went to a school in Wakefield, Virginia, with President Obama this week. The President and I not only saw children learning; we saw the future of your people and the future of your prosperity as well.

Australians are deeply grateful to your Greatest Generation for their mighty deeds. This week, I have seen a new generation of Americans . . . I genuinely believe they can be greater still.

Achieving prosperity while sharing its benefits requires farsighted educational reforms. In the same way, achieving growth while caring for our climate requires farsighted economic reforms. Breaking the link between economic growth and emissions growth is a difficult challenge for our economies, and we can only achieve it by working together. Our cooperation in key international forums and in research and development is making an important contribution. We must work together to achieve an historic transition to high technology, high skill, clean energy economies.

Shared values are the basis of our security alliance, and shared values are the basis of our economic partnership as well. Through hard work and education, we can deliver a strong economy and opportunity for all.

Americans are great optimists, and Australians will always ''have a go.''

So, conceived in the Pacific War and born in the Cold War, adapted to the space age and invoked in the face of terror, our indispensable alliance . . . is a friendship for the future.

This year is the 60th anniversary of the signing of our treaty. It is because of that I have the opportunity to speak to you today. For that, I am grateful. As I said to President Obama, it is an alliance 60 years young . . . with so much future to share.

And this is a timely opportunity, not so much for reflection on the past as for the discussion of our future. The bipolar world in which our Alliance was signed has long since disappeared. I am not sad about its passing: Hundreds of millions of people have a better life today. Democracy and human dignity have spread wide in the world in the last 20 years.

We have seen this from eastern Europe to East Asia in recent years, and we are seeing the hope of it in the Middle East right now. We understand that nothing is certain. There is still much for the people of the Middle East to do, and the governments of the world will be called on to help them do it. Yet I believe what we are seeing is unchanging realities of human nature finding a new expression in a new way.

For Australia's part, we will do what we can—and work with you—to support orderly transitions to democracy; to foster human rights and religious freedom within the countries of the Middle East; and to secure a lasting peace between them—a peace where no nation

threatens another—which is why we join you in condemning Iran's nuclear program.

And we also strive for peace . . . a peace where Israel is secure and where Palestinians have a state of their own, which is why we join you in calling on all parties to negotiate in good faith.

Our Alliance was signed 60 years ago in the Cold War, and it lives in a new world today.

And as momentous as the changes in the Middle East are, I believe it is in the Asia-Pacific where the global order is changing the most: We admire India's example as a true democracy; we never forget Indonesia's transition to create the world's third largest democracy in the world's largest Islamic country; and we applaud China's lifting some 500 million people out of poverty.

The center of global strategic and economic weight is shifting to this region. The rise of the Asia-Pacific will define our times. Like you, our relationship with China is important and complex. We encourage China to engage as a good global citizen, and we are clear-eyed about where differences do lie.

My guiding principle is that prosperity can be shared. We can create wealth together. The global economy is not a zero-sum game. There is no reason for Chinese prosperity to detract from prosperity in Australia, the United States or anywhere in the world.

America has always understood this principle of the economy . . . that everyone can benefit when everyone competes.

And for 60 years, your leadership in the Asia-Pacific has showed this. Your commitment to free trade and investment fueled the growth. Your presence and network of allies ensured the stability. You were indispensable in the Cold War, and you are indispensable in the new world, too. So your growing engagement with key countries in the region—like Japan, India, South Korea, and Indonesia—is enormously welcome.

We will work closely with you to strengthen the fabric of these relationships and underpin regional stability, strengthening regional institutions so that the countries of the Asia-Pacific increasingly manage the frictions of a growing and changing Asia-Pacific.

That's why your Nation's decision to join the East Asia Summit is such good news. The summit brings the leaders of the region's major powers together and has a mandate to deal with the whole range of economic, political and security issues our countries face.

Our relationship is evolving to meet these new challenges: from defense and intelligence to diplomacy and trade. Australia in the south, with South Korea and Japan to the north, form real Asia-Pacific partnerships with the United States.

Anchors of regional stability.

An alliance which was strong in the Cold War . . . an alliance which is strong in the new world.

In both of our countries, true friends stick together. Our nations do this, and our people do this as well. Nothing better tells this truth than the story of two firefighters.

Many Australians and Americans worked together in the late 1990s to be ready to protect the 2000 Sydney Olympics from possible terrorist attack. One group of Australians spent 2 months in New York, training and working, including a long time with New York's Fire Department Rescue 1. They worked hard together and became more than colleagues . . . they became mates.

So, when it was time to go home, the Australian commander gave Rescue 1's chief his Australian Army ''slouch hat,'' and the chief presented the Australians with a battle-scarred fire helmet, dated December 1998 and signed by members of the Rescue 1 crew, including Kevin Dowdell.

Three years later, Kevin Dowdell was one of the hundreds of New York firefighters killed when the towers came down. Kevin led his men in. His remains were never found, but that helmet was . . . in Australia. And Aussie firefighter Rob Frey found Kevin's sons.

James Dowdell is one of New York's bravest—a firefighter like his father before him. Patrick Dowdell is wearing his country's uniform in Afghanistan.

Rob came to America to give James the helmet his father signed: a precious possession, a last link to a father lost. And I give you their story: a precious possession, too.

These two men are here today.

Rob, James . . . good on you. Rob, James, we are so proud of what you represent. Your story says it all about the friendship between Australia and the United States: together in the hardest of times, friends for the future.

When our Alliance was signed 60 years ago, the challenges of the space age were still to come; the challenges of terrorism were still to come. For 60 years, leaders from Australia and the United States have looked inside themselves and found the courage to face those challenges; and after 60 years, we do the same today: to protect our peoples, to share our prosperity, to safeguard our future.

For ours is a friendship for the future. It has been from its founding, and it remains so today. You have a friend in Australia, and you have an ally—and we know what that means: In both our countries, true friends stick together. In both our countries, real mates talk straight.

So, as a friend, I urge you only this: Be worthy to your own best traditions.

Be bold.

In 1942, John Curtin—my predecessor, my country's great wartime leader—looked to America. I still do.

This year, you have marked the centenary of President Reagan's birth. He remains a great symbol of American optimism. The only greater symbol of American optimism . . . is America, itself.

The eyes of the world are still upon you. Your city on a hill cannot be hidden. Your brave and free people have made you the masters of recovery and reinvention.

As I stand before you in this cradle of democracy, I see a nation that changed the world, a nation that has known remarkable days. I firmly believe you are the same people who amazed me . . . when I was a small girl . . . by landing on the Moon. On that great day, I believed Americans could do anything.

I believe that still. You can do anything.

Thank you.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

At 11 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m., The Honorable Julia Gillard, Prime Minister of Australia, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms escorted the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps from the Chamber.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, (at 11 o'clock and 42 minutes a.m.), the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1203

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 155

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee:

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS—Mr. Barletta.

Mr. HENSARLING (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

STOP WRONG-HEADED ENERGY POLICIES

(Mr. BOUSTANY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, this country has never had an energy strategy. And the only thing worse than not having an energy strategy is having an energy policy that is actually hurting our country, hurting American energy production and American workers, and making us more dependent on foreign oil. That is what the Obama administration is doing right now.

Let's review the record. A moratorium on drilling in the Gulf of Mexico, hurting American energy production. A budget proposal that offers $50 billion in new taxes on independent, small energy companies working throughout the United States. Also, tax policy that is going to hurt large U.S. companies trying to compete for limited reserves around the world to meet U.S. energy needs. And finally, an attack on horizontal drilling because we have now found large reserves of oil and gas in our shale formations, and this administration is looking to shut all of that down.

And then they come forward because the price of oil, the price of oil at $105 a barrel today, they now want to open up the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which is supposed to be used in severe shortages. That is not an energy policy; that actually hurts our country.

It is time to stop these wrong-headed policies that are hurting American energy production and hurting American workers.

INVEST IN TOMORROW TO CREATE JOBS

(Mr. WALZ of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, you'll get no argument in this House that this is a country that has to get a handle on our budget, be fiscally responsible, reduce our national debt, and grow the economy. We owe nothing less to our children and grandchildren.

But I will be honest, I am pretty shocked by the lack of business sense, if you will, from some of my Republican colleagues. What my small businesses know in southern Minnesota is that, in addition to tightening their belts and getting efficiencies out of their businesses, they have to make smart investments for tomorrow.

So last week what did we do? We cut 41 percent of the NIH budget for research at the Mayo Clinic in my district that will lay off 68 researchers who equate into billions of dollars of medical research.

Republicans also want to cut funding for education. As a high school teacher I can tell you, where are the workers of tomorrow going to come from, and how are they going to compete to be the great innovators to win tomorrow?

We did all of that, at the same time protecting oil subsidies to the CEOs of the largest oil companies who made hundreds of billions. We have to be smart with taxpayer dollars, and we have to find ways to think like small, innovative businesses in places like the Mayo Clinic.

Save money, be efficient with our resources, invest in tomorrow to create jobs.

DRILLING MORATORIUM IS NONSENSE

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, gasoline is nearly $4 a gallon. Meanwhile, the administration seems to have a deliberate crusade against the U.S. energy industry and domestic energy independence.

Even before Steven Chu became Energy Secretary he said: ''Somehow we have to figure out a way to boost the price of gasoline to the levels in Europe.''

Well, that plan is working.

The administration is stonewalling the safe development of a Canadian pipeline to my district in southeast Texas that will send crude oil and jobs to American refineries. The administration is using the out-of-control EPA to implement questionable scientific regulations that hammer domestic energy capability. This includes the expensive regulations of CO_2 and the EPA attempt to defy the will of Congress by implementing cap-and-trade regulations.

The offshore drilling moratorium by the administration is nonsense. A court ordered the moratorium lifted. Now that same court has held the administration in contempt for not in fact lifting that moratorium.

Each of these is evidence that the administration is at war with domestic energy and the will of the American people. Meanwhile, gasoline prices are getting near those in Europe.

And that's just the way it is.

ADDICTION TO FOREIGN OIL

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, as oil and gas prices continue to rise, American consumers and businesses are facing sticker shock at the pump. The national average is $3.49, and the average in New York's capital region that I represent is $3.69. And yet, rather than take action to bring immediate gas price relief or create incentives to invest in clean energy alternatives that create jobs and grow our national security, the Republican budget would maintain our addiction to foreign oil.

The Republican spending bill ignores energy efficiency, clean energy, advanced vehicle technologies, and loan guarantees. What does it leave in place, though? Billions of dollars in subsidies for big oil companies that they have claimed they don't need, especially as they make record profits. And what do we get by throwing billions of hard-earned taxpayer dollars at these big oil companies? Less money in our pockets to get to work and around town.

Americans are better than the gasoline we put in our vehicles. It is time we wake up and realize it, and advance research and development.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, EBBY HALLIDAY

(Mr. SESSIONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, today is a very special day for not only me but many people who live in Dallas, Texas, because today is Ebby Halliday's 100th birthday. I have known Ebby for 22 years. This incredibly successful woman is one of the most generous and hardworking individuals I have ever known. Ebby has always been an entrepreneur, beginning her career selling hats. Today, she is the driving force for change in the real estate industry and a household name all across north Texas.

Ebby's incredible story is the embodiment of America's dream. Her dedication, work ethic, and vision have turned Ebby Halliday Realtors into one of the largest independently owned residential real estate companies in the Nation. Ebby is also well known as a respected community leader. Her active civic involvement and philanthropic efforts have inspired others to give back to those in need. Her name has become synonymous with ethics, class, and generosity.

Over the course of her lifetime, Ebby has witnessed many historic events and changes in our fast-paced world, yet her love for family, friends, community, and this Nation remains steadfast. I am proud to call her my friend, and I know she will be surrounded by many of those today in Dallas, Texas, as she celebrates her 100th birthday. May she be blessed with many more years of health and happiness.

Happy birthday, Ebby Halliday.

□ 1210

THE FORECLOSURE CRISIS

(Ms. EDWARDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to highlight the foreclosure crisis and recognize the thousands of distressed families in my district and across the country who continue to battle foreclosure. In Maryland our foreclosures approached nearly 800,000 in the fourth quarter of 2010. This crisis hits particularly hard in my district, where we have about 40 percent of our foreclosures statewide.

The foreclosure prevention and mitigation programs the Republican majority wants to terminate this week have helped thousands of hardworking families to stay in their homes and mitigated the effects of declining property values in neighborhoods across the country. Now, I know they're not perfect, but terminating these programs does not one single thing to spur the economy or protect middle class families in need. In fact, the effect is quite the opposite.

My colleagues claim that the programs haven't delivered on their promises. So what? What about the families who have benefited from the programs? What about the 1.2 million families that will face foreclosure this year?

This is another case of trying to throw the baby out with the bath water. Enough of that already. It's a simple question: Whose side are you on? Families, workers, working families, protecting their homes and communities; or are you on the side of the banks that want to take their homes?

LINCOLN/PROVIDENCE HOUSING AUTHORITY

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the creativity, effort, and resourcefulness of two local housing authorities in the First Congressional District of Rhode Island.

At a time when Rhode Island and many other States across our country are experiencing unacceptably high foreclosure rates, there are some beacons of light in the housing sector, beacons like the Town of Lincoln Housing Authority and the Housing Authority of the City of Providence, which are both being recognized by the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment officials as Awards of Merit winners for being well-positioned to meet the demand for safe and affordable housing for low- and very low-income families.

The Lincoln Housing Authority has instituted innovative programming for seniors, and the Providence Housing Authority has put in place energy efficiencies and cutting-edge health and fiscal planning programs.

These housing authorities are leaders in the development and maintenance of cost-effective approaches to responding to the variety of today's housing and community development challenges. Lincoln and Providence Housing Authorities not only effectively address local housing and neighborhood redevelopment challenges and concerns; they have also set a national example for similar organizations to learn from so they can meet the unique needs in their communities.

I congratulate you for your leadership in our State's housing industry, which proves yet again that Rhode Island innovation can combat both our State and national housing challenges.

RECOGNIZING THE NMI CHAPTER OF THE AMERICAN RED CROSS

(Mr. SABLAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate American Red Cross Month, I would like to pay particular tribute to the Northern Mariana Islands Chapter of the American Red Cross for the leading role it plays in responding to disasters large and small and in providing vital health and safety services in our islands.

Our small community has been blessed since 1978 with an exceptionally active and effective local Red Cross chapter. With just four staff members and 150 volunteers, the Northern Mariana Islands chapter last year provided financial assistance to 26 families who suffered house fires or localized flooding, facilitated emergency communications between 154 servicemembers and their families, provided community disaster preparedness materials to over 3,700 individuals, and trained over 2,300 students in courses on CPR, first aid, lifeguarding, and swimming.

The Northern Mariana Islands Chapter of the American Red Cross is an integral part of the Commonwealth community, a leader in health and safety training, and an invaluable partner in helping people prevent, prepare for, and respond to emergencies. We thank them for their work.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, as the recent job report shows, our economy is steadily improving with 12 straight months of private sector job growth.

Now, I state, now is the time for us to build on this progress and work together in a bipartisan effort to create jobs, not reduce jobs. I state, not to reduce jobs.

But, sadly, my Republican friends are letting the extremists dictate their agenda, protecting special interests at the expense of working families. The Republican budget would destroy 700,000 jobs and turn back the clock, I say, turn back the clock on our recent economic progress. This budget would do critical harm to American families. Mothers and children would be stripped of nutrition benefits from the WIC program. Thousands of youth would be kicked out of Head Start.

And now the Republicans are ready to continue their assault on the middle class by terminating the mortgage relief program that keeps families in their homes.

We should be helping families, not making them homeless. Let's work together to pass a budget that creates jobs and helps middle class Americans.

NO JOBS PLAN AND ASSAULT ON MIDDLE CLASS HOMEOWNERS

(Mr. SIRES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have been in control of this Chamber for the last 10 weeks now, and we have taken 164 recorded votes. Yet they still have no plan to create jobs and spur economic growth.

Instead of tackling unemployment, my Republican colleagues have now turned their efforts toward eliminating vital programs that are helping families deal with the fallout of the mortgage crisis.

Seven million families have lost their homes with another 3 million foreclosures expected through 2012. And what is the Republicans' response to this crisis? They want to terminate programs designed to help homeowners keep their houses and avoid foreclosures.

This week they will bring a bill to the floor that will abolish a program that makes temporary loans to unemployed homeowners to help cover mortgage payments until they can find a job.

Mr. Speaker, it is bad enough that they have no plan in sight to bring Americans back to work; but to actually put their energy towards ending programs that are helping the unemployed during difficult times is unacceptable.

I urge my colleagues to stop cutting programs that will keep American families in their homes and focus the legislation on creating jobs and move the economy forward.

THE REPUBLICANS' PRIORITIES

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority is indeed focused on jobs. In fact, their H.R. 1 would kill 700,000 jobs under the guise of fiscal responsibility. They'd cut transportation investments. They'd cut investments in education, student loans, and grants. They'd cut the COPS program, keeping our citizens safe with additional police on the street. They'd cut back on nutrition assistance to women, infants, and children.

What's not on the table? Well, corporate welfare. Six billion dollars in

ethanol subsidies—don't want to touch that. Twelve billion dollars in agriculture subsidies for corporate farms—can't touch that. Tax loopholes for Big Oil while they're gouging us at the pump and not paying taxes in the United States of America—can't put that on the table.

But the Republicans have shown us their priorities, and even their friends in the Senate yesterday refused to take up their bill.

And that's the way it is.

□ 1220

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EARMARK RECISION, SAVINGS AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the majority has now been in power for 10 weeks and has yet to offer a plan for job creation. Instead, they have chosen to ignore the warnings of economists from across the political spectrum and are promoting a continuing resolution that threatens to derail and reverse our Nation's recovery.

Instead of slashing programs that are vital to job creation and economic growth, we need to carefully examine the budget and eliminate all wasteful spending. That is why I am introducing the Surface Transportation Earmark Recision, Savings and Accountability Act of 2011, and I'd ask for bipartisan support on this. This legislation will reduce the deficit by $584 million by rescinding unspent funds authorized by Federal transportation projects requested by Members of Congress that date back to 1978.

Instead of eliminating research at the National Institutes of Health or eliminating funding to protect our air and water, let's focus on elimination of wasteful, unnecessary spending. I encourage you to work with me to include this language in the continuing resolution.

ADDRESSING THE CRIES OF THE NATION

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, we know that the economy is getting better. We know the job numbers are getting better, but we're still not there. We still have not addressed the cries of the people of this great Nation.

We do know that essential to addressing the cries is a sense of public confidence, and tied to that public confidence is something that is essential to everyone, and that is feeling safe in your home and being able to provide for your family. That is what two bills are about to address in this legislative body, two bills that should not pass—the attempts by the Republicans to defund two major programs that address what the people want and what the people need.

One, of course, is the Federal Housing Administration's Refinance Program and the other is the Emergency Homeowner Loan Program. That's for people who are without jobs through no fault of their own, either through unemployment or just simply medical conditions. Thirty thousand to 50,000 people were to be helped with that particular program. The other one is, of course, the underwater loan. Sixty-seven percent of homes in Nevada fall in that category; 25 percent in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, let's concentrate on giving people public confidence and hope in the future.

GOP MESSAGE TO CONSTITUENTS: SUCK IT UP

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today's message from the House Republicans is as follows—and these are my quotes, by the way—''This House will subsidize Big Oil and Wall Street, but our constituents who are losing their homes can just suck it up and find a bridge to sleep under.''

Just about every economist under the sun agrees that we won't have robust job growth and recovery until foreclosures are under control; but rather than putting forth a proposal to improve the deeply flawed homeowner assistance programs, the GOP panders to its Wall Street base by proposing we do away with homeowner assistance altogether.

I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this anti-homeowner, anti-middle class proposal so we can turn to the serious work of improving homeowners' assistance programs that are currently failing.

RADICALIZATION OF THE REPUBLICAN AGENDA

(Ms. SPEIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the House Homeland Security Committee will hold a hearing that will actually have the potential to make our Nation less safe. The title of the hearing is ''The Extent of Radicalization in the American Muslim Community,'' but what's truly radical is using committee time and resources to profile and demonize whole communities of people based on their faith. American Muslims are peaceful, law-abiding citizens, and many have cooperated with the U.S. authorities to help prevent terrorist attacks. We should target terrorists based on actions, not religion.

When law enforcement agencies were asked to identify terrorist groups within their States, Muslim extremist groups ranked 11th out of 18. Neo-Nazis, environmental extremists, and anti-tax groups were all more prevalent. Radicalization and homegrown terrorism are serious and legitimate concerns and deserve thoughtful examination, not an ideologically motivated charade.

We must continue efforts to defeat al Qaeda wherever they exist, but one key to combating extremism is winning the hearts and minds of the next generation of Muslims.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 836, EMERGENCY MORTGAGE RELIEF PROGRAM TERMINATION ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 151 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 151

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. 836) to rescind the unobligated funding for the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program and to terminate the program. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. 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 Financial 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 Financial Services now printed in the bill. Each section of 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. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those received for printing in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII in a daily issue dated March 9, 2011, or earlier and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so received may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or a designee and shall be considered as read if printed. 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman, my friend from New York (Ms.

SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 151 provides for a modified open rule that allows any Member to offer an amendment to the underlying bill as long as it is preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and complies with House rules. This rule continues to build on the commitment of the Republican majority to consider legislation in a more open, honest, and thoughtful way.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill. This legislation was introduced by my dear friend, the gentleman, the chairman of the Republican Conference, JEB HENSARLING, on February 28, 2011, and marked up in the Financial Services Committee last week on March 3.

This legislation went through regular order, which included committee hearings prior to a markup and making the text of the legislation publicly available for Members and the public to review prior to consideration in the committee and on the House floor.

The chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California, DAVID DREIER, has once again provided Members of this body a transparent and accountable structure under the rule we are debating and discussing today, allowing Members of both sides of this aisle and of this body to offer amendments and to join in the debate of the underlying legislation.

H.R. 836 repeals the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program and rescinds and permanently cancels all unobligated funds. It directs the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to conduct a study to determine the extent of usage of the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program by covered homeowners, which includes members of the armed services, veterans, and Gold Star recipients.

□ 1230

Lastly, it requires the Secretary to submit the report to Congress, including the results of that study and identifying any best practices that could be applied to the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program for ''covered homeowners.''

The Dodd-Frank Act established a $1 billion Housing and Urban Development Emergency Homeowner Loan Program, which provides loans or credit advances to unemployed borrowers who cannot pay their mortgages to make mortgage payments for a period of 12 months, with a possible extension.

These loans increase the amount of the homeowner's indebtedness, or the borrower's indebtedness, so that a borrower who is unable to pay back either the original amount of principal or the additional loans made under the program would quite probably be worse off in the long run. These borrowers derive no benefit from the program and the government will suffer the losses from their eventual defaults. That's the way the program was set up by the Democrat majority.

Continued government intervention and questionable use of taxpayer dollars only prolongs our current economic crisis and ensures that the housing market will continue to struggle. The market needs to find its own footing free of government intervention and manipulation so that we can get on with a full recovery.

The deficit is expected to reach a record $1.65 trillion this year, while our national debt is well over $14 trillion and growing rapidly. As a matter of fact, growing so rapidly that last month a $230-plus billion as a deficit for 1 month, the largest in the history of this Nation, was recorded. Yet what do we hear out of the White House? Spend, spend, spend, including against this bill that they have offered to veto because it would save some money. The U.S. simply cannot afford to loan billions of taxpayers' dollars that will not be repaid.

The Obama administration in its FY 2012 budget proposal estimates that this program will have an almost 98 percent subsidy rate. That means for every dollar spent, the government is expected up-front to lose 98 cents. On every dollar of this program, the government right up-front is expected to lose 98 cents.

Mr. Speaker, no wonder Republicans are trying to go back and look at the programs, the massive spending programs, not only by President Obama and former Speaker NANCY PELOSI but also the committee chairmen and those who brought these measures to the floor that have had a stunning impact on the economy of this country.

Also, HUD regulations set up a process where the bridge loan can be forgiven over a 5-year period. This is irresponsible. It is irresponsible not only now; it was irresponsible at the time it was passed by this House, passed by the Senate, and signed by the President. This is not a loan program, but another government welfare program.

Job creation is the most effective foreclosure prevention tool. Job losses—rather than unsustainable mortgage terms—are now the driving force behind foreclosures and mortgage defaults. The government does not need to be adding additional debt obligations onto borrowers who are already struggling with their current commitments, particularly when doing so adds to the debt burden of every single American, including those who took out these loans who have to suffer through the process as they are seeing their use of a government program that provides not only more debt for the country but tremendous strain on themselves.

Government was not there to help. They were there to indebt the American people. Congress should focus on job creation, not welfare and giveaway programs. This is the best way to prevent more foreclosures and to get our economy back on track.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that enacting H.R. 836 would decrease Federal budget deficits by $840 million over the 2011–2021 period. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle understand the current dire emergency that we are facing with the state of the U.S. economy and that American families are struggling. Why should the government go and make matters worse? It is our job as Members of Congress and as legislators to ensure that the policy which is passed by this House has integrity and can be backed up by the full measure of a free enterprise system instead of a government backstop. It is that government backstop that Republicans objected to then and object to now.

We need to make sure that our greatest days lie in our future, not the government handing out checks because the government didn't mind the blank check that it originally satisfied itself for in this legislation. We should be creating opportunities. We should not be holding back Americans from earning not only the opportunity for potential in their future but also for making their life better. Eliminating this program will save taxpayer dollars and encourage more responsible government spending by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, this was an unwise program, and today Republicans are on the floor of the House of Representatives to say we can do the right thing today. I encourage a ''yes'' vote on the rule and a ''yes'' vote on the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague for yielding this time to me, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I certainly want to agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, that what the world is waiting for this Congress to do is to create jobs. We are approaching 100 days here without a single bill to do that, and we certainly look forward to that great day.

Mr. Speaker, it was not that long ago that this country was facing the real possibility of another Great Depression. The financial crisis of 2008 was caused by reckless decisionmaking on Wall Street that had deep and painful impacts on hardworking Americans everywhere. As a result, millions of people lost everything. They lost jobs, retirement savings, and homes. All across America, families anguished over how to avoid homelessness, how to feed their families, how to keep them intact, how to keep their lives together for just one more day.

Three years later, we are starting to see the signs of a fragile recovery. However slowly, we have started to see modest private sector job growth over the past few months. However, we are far from where we need to be, and the troubled housing market remains in complete disarray. Millions of Americans are unemployed and still struggling to keep up with their mortgage payments. Millions more are saddled with mortgages worth more than their homes.

Foreclosures swallowed up a whopping 1.2 million homes across the country in 2010, up from 900,000 in 2009. Despite the Republicans' apparent lack of concern for the ongoing foreclosure mess, many estimate that the United States will eclipse previous yearly totals and foreclose on even more Americans in 2011.

There is overwhelming evidence that everybody knows about that many of these foreclosures were faulty or downright illegal, and yet no accounting of this failure is demanded. But the people who lost their homes have lost it in major ways and have no recourse except some of these bills. These bills obviously need a lot of help. I couldn't agree more. They are not the best we could do. And yet the sad thing to me is that once these four bills are done away with, there is no replacement, and we simply leave Americans to function as best they can.

□ 1240

If we are a Nation that cares whether or not our neighbors are kicked out onto the street, it's clear that we can't end these programs designed to lend a helping hand without something to replace them. The Emergency Homeowners Loan Program was created to help prevent foreclosures that are the result of massive financial hardships caused by unemployment and underemployment across the Nation.

Admittedly, some foreclosure prevention efforts of the past few years have not had as much success as we hoped. And we certainly have had very little cooperation from banks. They were simply asked to help, not required to. Democrats agree that the programs need improvement and would support a process to allow for bipartisan collaboration. So it's a shame that we stand here today ready to kill this program before it even gets off the ground or has a chance to help stem the tide of foreclosure.

My colleagues on the other side are ready to end the program without offering any solution to what is clearly a continuing problem. But if we don't provide help to our constituents in need, then who? It surely won't be the big banks foreclosing on our neighbors at record numbers. Just today, the New York Times reports that the CEO of Bank of America rejected the idea of reducing home loans for Americans in need. He thinks if he has to do it for one, he'll have to do it for all.

What's fair about big banks reporting record profits by kicking homeowners out on the street? What's fair about banking executives walking away from their failed mortgage schemes without punishment while thousands live in their cars or subsist in squalor not fit for a global superpower? The audacity to call for a fair modification process after swindling millions of Americans with predatory mortgages and walking away with record profits as the house of cards collapsed is simply maddening. Yet we stand here today preparing to debate a bill that will tell the American people that we just don't care.

With so many homeowners still facing foreclosure, we should be focused on ways to improve programs designed to keep people in their homes. Many of these families are facing insurmountable odds on their own, but with just a little help they may be able to make it through this tough time. But instead of reforming the program, today we are eliminating it.

I would like to talk a little about the process. Today's rule is called a modified open rule, but this is not an open process. For starters, if the debate on the bill inspires an amendment, a Member cannot offer it because it would not have been printed in time. Secondly, if the bill is changed by an amendment, Members will not have the ability to respond to the changes. This limits the give-and-take of ideas that is the hallmark of dynamic and rigorous debate. But the biggest problem with this process is that Members who want to reform the program rather than completely get rid of it must find a germane offset, which is nearly impossible because the bill completely eliminates the program. In other words, any amendment to save any part of it would have to be offset by new money.

We agree that reform is needed. Members have ideas for reform, alternatives to simply eliminating the existing program. Unfortunately, under this process, these alternatives cannot be offered.

I urge my colleagues on the other side to work with us to improve these foreclosure programs, stem the foreclosure tide, and strengthen our middle class. This bill does not do that.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on today's rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by the way, we are working with all the Members of Congress. And that's why we went through regular order, which was a new process for this House from the last 4 years. We also came to the Rules Committee and allowed an open process. And any Member that chose to have an amendment to be offered today simply had to go and tell us ahead of time that they would like a preprinting notice and they could get that done. That is working together with every single Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield such time as she may consume to the chairwoman of the Housing Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule, House Resolution 151, and House Resolution 150, the rule for H.R. 830.

Last week, the Committee on Financial Services considered and approved two bills: H.R. 836, the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program Termination Act, and H.R. 830, the FHA Refinance Program Termination Act. H.R. 836 would terminate the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program and rescind any unobligated balances remaining under the program.

The Emergency Mortgage Relief Program, created by the Dodd-Frank Act, establishes a $1 billion fund to provide loans or credit advances to borrowers who cannot pay their mortgages because of unemployment or reduction in income. To date, no funds have been provided to homeowners under this program, and serious questions remain about its cost, effectiveness, and benefits. The CBO estimates the program will have a 98 percent subsidy rate, meaning that for every dollar loaned under this program, 98 cents is not expected to be repaid. Given the country's current fiscal situation, no program warrants funding when benefits are speculative at best and substantial taxpayer losses are certain.

The other bill approved by the Financial Services Committee, H.R. 830, which will be addressed by rule in a little bit, H.R. 830, the FHA Refinance Program Termination Act, would rescind all unobligated balances made available for use under this program. More than $8 billion in TARP funds have been set aside for the FHA Refinance Program, and $50 million has been disbursed since September 2010.

For this extraordinary investment of their money, taxpayers have thus far gotten very little return. The administration originally estimated this program would help between 500,000 and 1.5 million homeowners. However, only 44 loans have been refinanced and only 245 applications have been submitted.

This program has been plagued by problems from the start. Borrowers are frustrated that few lenders participate in the program, and it is difficult for borrowers to even find out if their mortgage servicer has agreed to participate. Rather than continue to spend money we do not have on programs that do not work, Congress should focus on creating the certainty job creators need for economic activity and hiring. This means we must root out wasteful government spending on ineffective programs such as the FHA Refinance Program. What the American people want are jobs, not a handout or a program that doesn't work or is ineffective.

I urge my colleagues to support the rules for H.R. 836 and H.R. 830.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to agree with the gentlelady from Illinois who just spoke, who said what the American people want is jobs. I agree with her. And when we assess the record of the new majority on this issue, I think we have to assess that it's found very wanting.

This is the 10th week of the new majority. In 10 weeks, they found a way to shut down women's health clinics by defunding Planned Parenthood. They've found a way to essentially repeal 30 years' worth of protections for our drinking water and our air and our land. They've found a way to pass a budget that cuts education, that saps strength and energy from our job creators in this country, but they haven't found one bill, 1 minute, one debate over a plan to work together to create jobs for the American people.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the American people want Republicans and Democrats to come together and figure out an environment that will encourage entrepreneurs and small businesses to create jobs for our country. The majority has, frankly, done everything but that. And today is yet another bill that I think is a wasted opportunity in that regard.

I view today's debate through the eyes of three constituents I interacted with at home this weekend. One was a gentleman who runs a music distribution company. They produce CDs for people who have written and recorded music and don't have a label yet so they can get their music out to the rest of the world. He employs 500 people, and he wants to grow. And in order to grow, he needs people who are facile with various software and other technologies that will help his company grow. He depends upon graduates from our community colleges and our 4-year colleges and universities. And he didn't understand why the majority wants to cut the maximum college scholarship under Pell Grants by $845, thereby taking employees away, conceivably, from him by taking them out of school.

□ 1250

It's the homebuilder that I met who really can't call himself a homebuilder anymore because he's not building any homes, and he wonders what we're doing to try to restore faith and confidence to the real estate market so that Americans will feel secure and confident enough to buy a home and put him and his workers back to work. He wonders what we're doing.

It was the gentleman I met yesterday who runs a biotech company that has two employees, and he depends on contracts from the National Institutes of Health to do research on various pharmaceutical products. He wants to double the size of his company, put just two more people to work, but he won't hire them as long as the threat of a government shutdown is imminent.

This is the wrong bill at the wrong time on the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentlelady.

What we should be doing is coming together, Republicans and Democrats, to cut spending, to find ways to sensibly cut spending. Many of us on the floor, for instance, 2 weeks ago voted to not send $1.5 billion to Iraq to fund their police department. Many of us voted not to spend a substantial amount of money for the Brazilian Cotton Institute. Many of us voted to say that if you make over a quarter of a million dollars a year as a farmer you shouldn't get a crop subsidy. These are areas that we agreed upon to reduce spending.

Let's work to sensibly reduce spending but let's not cut education and let's not undermine jobs. By all means, let's bring to the floor a bill that says to my friend that runs the music production company, we will help train the workers that you need; that says to my friend that wishes he were a homebuilder, we will talk to these banks that have record amounts of money in their balance sheets and get them lending money again so people can buy a home; and says to our friend that's running the small biotech company, you don't have to worry that there's going to be gaping cuts in the research budget of the National Institutes of Health, we're going to fund them, and they're going to continue to pay people to be the best and the brightest and find cures to diseases, and you can hire those two more people.

Ten weeks, no jobs bill, no jobs plan, no cooperation to produce an environment where small business and entrepreneurs can put America back to work. Let's put aside our differences. Let's get to work on solving the real problems of our country.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, you know, I'm shocked at our friend after friend on the Democratic side who say ''no jobs bill,'' ''no jobs bill.'' But my friends also recognize what the American public does, that we voted, literally the first vote in this House, to overturn what is known as ObamaCare, the massive government takeover of health care in this country that would result in a loss of 800,000 jobs. Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority does have a jobs bill, and that is to go and rescind what the Democrats have outrageously done and that is to put this country in a diminished position not only with us being competitive overseas but also for us diminishing American jobs.

No, we're not going to go and do a, quote, jobs bill to add jobs. We're trying to simply go back and save the jobs that are being lost today and would be lost by wasteful government spending, huge government bureaucracies, and so my friends on the other side simply want to come and attack us. Well, the Republicans have it, and so do the American people. We are going to stop the outrageous spending. We are going to attack the rules and regulations which are killing not only business but losing jobs all across this country. We, as Republicans, are going to stand up and say $4 gasoline is outrageous, Mr. President; work on the things from your administration that you are doing that ruin jobs, that make sure we have higher gas prices at the pump, and do those things that would help the American people.

The Republican House majority is one-half of one-third of the body, and we are one-third of government. We are trying to do the things that the American people sent us here for. We are all about trying to reduce wasteful government spending. We are going to take on the laws that have been passed by this President and the former two sessions of Congress that were outrageous spending, tax increases, an assault on employers, making it more difficult for the American people to have freedom and diminishing our future.

So every time one of our Democrat friends goes and says there's no jobs bill by the Republicans, the American people will get it. The Republicans first have to save the jobs that are at risk today; 800,000 net free enterprise system jobs that—if we do not overturn ObamaCare that was passed by this body on March 22, a year ago, we're going to lose even more jobs.

So the most immediate thing we're doing is trying to reduce wasteful government spending, to try and do away with and attack rules and regulations that will kill the jobs that we have, and to make sure that we're telling the American people that this spending spree that we're on causes a massive deficit, a hemorrhaging by this government, including last month $230 billion we overspent. Then we're doing our job. If we are doing those things, we're trying to save the jobs that we've got.

Mr. Speaker, that is what the Republican majority is about. We're not going to let the Democrats get us off our game. We understand what they want. They want to talk about, well, we can look at doing back to some of the spending, but when it comes down to it, they can't pick anything they really will support. Everything is a sacred cow. Everything that we do is a problem if you go and touch it.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party, the Republican majority, led by Speaker BOEHNER and our majority leader ERIC CANTOR, is all about trying to get back to an America where we have a balance, to where we don't lose more jobs, where we don't add more debt, and we stand up for the American people. That's why we're the new majority party.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) to respond.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect and affection for my friend from Texas. He's a valued Member of this House and someone who cherishes this institution and represents his constituents well. I would like to respond to two of the points that he's made.

First, he makes reference to this 800,000 job loss as a result of the health care act. There was a prediction made before the final version of the act was put together, very early in the process, by a group that frankly is rather ideologically to his side of the aisle, that predicted that 800,000 jobs would be lost. In fact, most economists have argued that hundreds of thousands of jobs would be gained, but more importantly, Mr. Speaker, than predictions is reality.

The health care law was signed into law almost a year ago, and I wonder if anyone on the majority side could tell us how many jobs the economy has lost in that year. How many jobs has the economy lost since the health care bill was signed into law?

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SESSIONS. You asked if somebody who knew the answer would stand up. I don't know the answer, but what I will tell you is that we will have the taxation start, and yet, the plan kicks in 2014. So massive taxation will start, and then we will find out what happens.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, the answer is that the economy has added over 1 million private sector jobs since the health care law was signed into effect, so predictions of great job loss have turned out not to be the case.

Secondly, the gentleman made reference to the sort of great opposition to this law around the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

□ 1300

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

So the fact here is that despite this prediction of 800,000 jobs lost, in fact, the economy has gained more than 1 million private sector jobs since this happened.

But I want to address one other thing that he said. He said that our goal is to ''knock the Republicans off their game.'' We do not think this is a game. We think 15 million unemployed people is a very serious national crisis, and we do not want to play a game. We want to come to an agreement that would create an environment for small businesses and entrepreneurs to create jobs for the American people.

He mentioned sacred cows. We don't think college scholarships are wasteful spending. We don't think that student loans are reckless spending. We don't think that reading teachers and math coaches for our neediest children is wasteful spending. We don't think that job-training grants for people who have lost their job is wasteful. We think that cutting those programs wastes jobs in the private sector. That's why we oppose their reckless budget plan. That's why we beseech the majority, let's get to work putting Americans to work.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I stood up and openly said I have no clue how many jobs have been added. But the million-job figure that the gentleman quotes is not a net figure. It's not a net figure. We have lost many, many, many times what we have gained. And the net figure means that when you add in what has been added versus what was lost, this country is in trouble. And I think the American people understand this. They understood it last November. They understand it now.

People are scared. They're scared about their future. They're scared about their job. They're scared about how much gasoline is going to go up. They're scared about whether the EPA is going to come put some more rules and regulations on them. They're scared about what will happen in the long run with their job and health care. They see the diminishment of freedom.

They see where we are in trouble not only in our own homes; we are in trouble with our country. They see that we ran a $230 billion deficit last month alone. They see where this administration is incapable of looking at facts and factors and making a realistic choice about, now that we understand what's happening, what are we going to do when we're in trouble.

The Republican Party is here, and we are not going to be knocked off our game. We're going to go and try and save as many jobs as we can from the onerous rules and regulation, the excessive taxation, and perhaps worst of all, the inattention to try and create a better circumstance for this country.

So that's what we're going to do. We're going to go after and we're going to repeal this ObamaCare. We're going to stay after the rules and regulations, and we're going to make sure that the middle class of this country has a chance to save the job that they have rather than diminishing it.

You have seen, Mr. Speaker, all across this country the States who are in the most trouble have top-to-bottom Democratic-controlled legislatures as well as Democrat Governors. Those States are unwilling to make tough choices. They're unwilling to do the things which would say ''no'' to constituencies who are special interests. Today, the Republicans are on the floor of the House of Representatives, and we're saying not only ''no'' to special interests, but what we're trying to say is that we need to use common sense and balance.

And I recognized 14 years ago when I came up here that common sense is not common in Washington. But today, part of that common sense takes place with, we're going to read the bills before we vote on them; we're going to go through regular order; we're going to relook at the things which have been passed which diminish jobs and which harm our economy. And those are the things which are on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud of our Republican majority. I'm proud of our Speaker, who's from the great State of Ohio, who understands himself, personally, because of the State where he is from, that the State of Ohio is in need of leadership, real leadership, in Washington, DC, just as the rest of the country. And so the Republican Party stands on the floor of the House today. We are about jobs. We're about reducing wasteful Washington spending, and we're going to stand for common sense.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I would like to yield myself 1 minute, if I may, simply to say that one of the things that we're hearing today is that these bills are unneeded.

Let me just quote a little bit from the Dallas Morning News: home prices down 3.6 percent in December, 40 percent of home sales in north Texas are foreclosed and short-sale homes. A Dallas housing analyst said, ''There's no doubt the foreclosures continue to have an impact on the market,'' and they're going to receive 135 million assistance unless all these bills die.

I will insert the full text of the Dallas Morning News into the RECORD. I obviously mention Dallas because that is the district of my colleague, and I wanted to point out that there's pain at home.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Feb. 22, 2011]

DALLAS-AREA HOME PRICES SAG AGAIN

(By Steve Brown)

Dallas-area home prices show no sign of a rebound in the latest measure. And economists worry that further declines are ahead.

Prices in the area were down 3.6 percent in Standard & Poor's/Case-Shiller Home Price Index released Tuesday.

The December report was the sixth consecutive year-over-year Dallas decline in the closely watched monthly survey.

Nationwide home prices were 2.4 percent lower than a year earlier, according to Case-Shiller.

Only two of the 20 cities that Case-Shiller tracks had increases from previous-year levels.

''Despite improvements in the overall economy, housing continues to drift lower and weaker,'' Standard & Poor's David Blitzer said in the report.

Dallas' decline in December was a bit improved from the 4.2 percent annual price drop that the area saw in November.

Home prices in the area remain about 9 percent below where they were at the peak of the market in 2007.

So far, that's the smallest such drop among all the U.S. markets that the Case-Shiller index tracks.

Nationwide prices have slid about 30 percent since residential values began falling in summer 2006.

Dallas prices at the end of 2010 were about 5 percent lower than they were in June, when the local housing market appeared to have turned the corner.

Since then, sales have plunged and the number of foreclosures coming onto the market has grown—both creating downward pressure on prices.

''There's no doubt the foreclosures continue to have an impact on the market,'' said David Brown, who heads the Dallas office of housing analyst Metrostudy Inc. ''We are [also] continuing to see the effect of the slowdown in sales after the tax credit expired.

POSITIVE, BUT . . .

''I think the reports will start to turn more positive in the second half of the year,'' Brown said.

In the meantime, economic growth in the area and expected gains in home sales later in 2011 will reduce the unsold inventory, he said.

But there are also worries that thousands of public-sector layoffs will add to the housing sector's woes. ''Most of the people who work in the public sector are homeowners,'' said Dr. James Gaines, an economist with the Real Estate Center at Texas A&M University. ''It will be like another wave of private-sector layoffs.''

Gaines said it's too early to tell how many teachers and other state and local government workers will lose their income because of Texas' huge budget shortfall.

But he knows the impact of these layoffs could cause further home foreclosures and certainly reduce potential housing purchases. ''Hopefully, the private sector will absorb some of these folks losing their jobs,'' Gaines said. ''It depends on how severe it is.''

Case-Shiller said that at the end of 2010, the biggest home price declines were in Detroit, down 9.1 percent from a year earlier, and Phoenix, down 8.3 percent.

Washington, D.C., (up 4.1 percent) and San Diego (up 1.7 percent) were the only markets that Case-Shiller studied where December prices were higher.

Dallas-area home prices began falling in July after eight months of year-over-year gains.

TROUBLED PROPERTIES

By recent estimates, almost 40 percent of monthly home sales in North Texas are distressed properties—previously foreclosed and short-sale homes. On average, these homes sell for about 30 percent below nondistressed prices.

Case-Shiller looks at the actual value of specific single-family homes over time. The index does not include condominiums and townhouses. It only covers pre-owned properties—no new construction.

Declining home prices.

Percentage change in home prices in December 2010 compared to year earlier in each market.

Atlanta	−8.0%
Boston	−0.8%
Charlotte	−4.4%
Chicago	−7.4%
Cleveland	−4.0%
Dallas	−3.6%
Denver	−2.4%
Detroit	−9.1%
Las Vegas	−4.7%
Los Angeles	−0.2%
Miami	−3.7%
Minneapolis	−5.3%
New York	−2.3%
Phoenix	−8.3%
Portland	−7.8%
San Diego	1.7%
San Francisco	−0.4%
Seattle	−6.0%
Tampa	−6.2%
Washington	4.1%
Composite–20 city	−2.4%

Source: Standard & Poor's and Fiserv

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

As I said on the floor this morning and listening to my esteemed colleague on the other side, I must tell you that I am a bit upset, for he talks about common sense and balance. These two words, ''common sense'' and ''balance,'' are something that I talk about all the time. As the ranking member of the Government Oversight and Reform Committee, we talk about common sense; and we talk about balance.

And part of common sense and balance is trying to make sure our children are educated. Part of common sense and balance is making sure that I helped my neighbor who just died of cancer. I would have to go into my pocket over and over again to give him the money to supplement his chemo. Common sense and balance.

Common sense and balance is trying to make sure that people will have jobs when I appear at my jobs fair in a few weeks, and that it won't be just like last year where 9,000 people showed up at 6 o'clock in the morning and circled around the buildings. Common sense and balance means that the students at Morgan State University will not have their Pell Grants reduced by $800 when they are struggling right now. They're working and trying to get a job if they can get one, and working doing the best that they can, and then it's their turn. Common sense and balance says we don't cut them off.

And so as I listen, I think about all of this, and I'm trying to figure out, how do the American people get common sense and balance out of what is going on in this House?

Now, with regard to I heard my friend talk about regulations, just this morning in a hearing that we had in Government Reform, we had all of these execs from corporations come and talk about how they wanted to get rid of ''job-killing'' regulations. Every one of them agreed with me that regulations are important because they protect the health, welfare and safety of people. And as I told them this morning, I said to them, and I was very clear, I said, when I was a young student, a high school student, and I would go to Bethlehem Steel every summer to work, when I blew my nose after being there for an hour, when the mucus came out, it was black. It was regulations that addressed that. And there were men who had been there 40 years who were breathing that every day, 8 hours a day. And many of them died early. Common sense and balance.

Common sense and balance. And then I said to my constituents, and I said it to them at a town hall meeting this week, I said, I wish the Congress would address issues like we deal with our family problems. If you've got a family problem, if you have got a daughter or a son who wants to go to college, maybe go to an expensive college, you don't say to them, you're not going to go to college. You find a way to, yeah, cut back on some things. You don't cut back on everything. You don't say to that child, you cannot go to school because it's now their turn. You just don't turn your back on them. You don't cut off people's jobs and their training when they're trying to be retrained, when that father who's lost his job is trying to be retrained——

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. So common sense and balance.

I rise today in strong opposition to this rule, which provides for consideration of H.R. 836, a bill that seeks to kill the Emergency Homeowner Loan Program. This program was created to provide limited, low-cost loans to enable borrowers who are unemployed through no fault of their own—through no fault of their own—or who face debilitating medical costs to continue paying their mortgages until they have made their way through the storm.

□ 1310

By the way, a lot of people say they will never face these medical costs. Well, all of us are the walking wounded. All of us will face difficult problems. The question is: Will America be the America it has always been? We do not get our authority by might; we get it by the way we treat each other.

And so these folks are going through some difficult times. These are the same people that this loan program is about; these are the same people who have shown up time after time sitting in the front row of something I call my foreclosure prevention program with tears running down their faces. Many of them have never missed a mortgage payment, have worked hard every day and have done everything that was required of them. These are our American neighbors. They are the American neighbors who sit in Ohio. They are the ones in California and New York. Those are our neighbors. They are in a time of need.

We are talking about a billion-dollar program to try to help people as they are struggling, trying to get up after an economy—by the way, where regulations failed them. They find themselves in these difficulties in many instances because people were not regulating properly.

And, yes, it upsets me because I go back to a district every night, 40 miles away from here, where people are sad and there are areas in my district where you probably have 25 percent unemployment. So I care about the jobs. They are important to me. I care about people living and staying in their homes.

And so if anything was said by the November elections, it was about we need to sit down and get together and work through people's problems like any family would address family problems. And we must be about the business of making sure that we do those things to have a future. I don't want any child in America—I don't care whether he is in your district, Mr. Speaker, or anybody else's district—I want every child to have an opportunity. I want the same opportunities for your children, Mr. Speaker, as I want for mine.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to inform the gentlewoman from New York that I have no further requests for time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the facts of this case state very clearly that this Nation is being overrun; it is being overrun by too much taxing, too much borrowing, too much spending. Just last month, we hit a record deficit, $223 billion. This is unacceptable. The status quo of where we are moving is not acceptable. With the debt looming at $14 trillion and unemployment hovering across the country at 9 percent, and much higher in many areas of the country, including congressional districts that are hurting even more, and I understand this because those who first lose their jobs many times are disabled people and I understand disabled people and their plight that they have also and it is sad, and it hurts us as Members of Congress and it hurts the American people. The American people asked Congress to rein in the spending and do something about jobs, and that is what we are doing. We are not making excuses; we are getting the job accomplished.

Eliminating this program will save taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars. By gaining control of government spending and eliminating wasteful Washington government spending and handouts, the private sector can gain some confidence in the economy and start investing in jobs and a brighter economic future.

I applaud my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), for bringing this legislation, and to the chairman of the Rules Committee, the young chairman, DAVID DREIER, favorite son from California, San Dimas, California. DAVID comes here and so ably runs our Rules Committee for us. We thank them for providing an open and transparent process.

I encourage a ''yes'' vote on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 830, FHA REFINANCE PROGRAM TERMINATION ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 150 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 150

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. 830) to rescind the unobligated funding for the FHA Refinance Program and to terminate the program. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. 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 Financial 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 Financial Services now printed in the bill. Each section of 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. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those received for printing in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII in a daily issue dated March 9, 2011, or earlier and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so received may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or a designee and shall be considered as read if printed. 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for a modified open rule for the consideration of H.R. 830, the FHA Refinance Program Termination Act. It provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services, and for consideration of any amendments proposed by Members that conform to House rules and which were preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD no later than March 9, today.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to stand before the House today in support of this rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 830, the FHA Refinance Program Termination Act.

I appreciate the hard work of the distinguished chairman of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. BACHUS, as well as the hard work of the bill's chief sponsor, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD), in creating this piece of legislation which will help this Congress continue to take concrete steps to rein in the out-of-control Federal mandatory spending.

The FHA Refinance Program was originally promoted by the current administration as a way to bail out the so-called underwater borrowers who for whatever reason found themselves in over their heads in personal and mortgage debt and unable to pay their mortgages.

The 110th Congress passed TARP, which was enabling legislation for this new program, thereby effectively allowing lenders to transfer high-risk mortgages, through the FHA, onto the backs of taxpayers in the case of likely default. The $8 billion in TARP funds was originally identified for this new expansive program.

While no one likes to see homeowners in distress and at risk of losing their homes, the fact of the matter is that this new program, no matter how well intentioned, is expensive and has also proven to be a woefully ineffective program at its best.

□ 1320

Originally it was asserted by the administration that this program would allow up to 1½ million homeowners or, as some reports in the papers said, 3 million to 4 million distressed homeowners to obtain more favorable mortgage terms, all guaranteed by U.S. taxpayers in case of ultimate default.

However, Mr. Speaker, there are several problems with this new mortgage bailout program.

First, in some and perhaps in many cases, this program would subsidize irresponsible lenders and borrowers and insulate them from the consequences of bad choices and, in some cases, intentionally speculative financial choices that were made during the housing boom, thus shifting the economic impact of those bad choices and decisions onto the backs of responsible homeowners and the taxpayers. This is troubling, for this should not be the role of the Federal Government—to pick winners and losers in the marketplace.

While homeownership in this country is certainly to be encouraged, this program is exactly the wrong way to go about it. The program basically tells a lender, Don't worry, it's okay. So what if you knowingly encouraged or lent more than you knew the borrower could afford? We'll bail you out of your predicament so you don't have to feel any of the economic consequences of your actions. The program tells borrowers, So what if you took out the maximum loan and got the most expensive house that you could buy even though you knew it was highly unlikely that you would be able to afford those payments in the future. We will bail you out too and insulate you from the consequences of actions as well, and we'll shift all the costs and send the bill, via the FHA, onto the backs of the already overburdened taxpayers.

That's apparently where the buck stops in this program. It stops on the back of already burdened taxpayers and the Nation that itself is $14 trillion underwater in a crushing and unprecedented debt.

Second, it appears that in spite of the urgent housing crisis, this so-called emergency program to bail out underwater mortgages hasn't actually helped anyone. According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development statistics, as of February 3, only 44 refinancing applications have been processed by the agency. That's 44 homeowners out of the potentially 3 million to 4 million as originally asserted by the program's sponsors. Mr. Lamar Wooley, a spokesman for HUD, was quoted in a National Journal Daily article last week as saying ''the department has not yet spent any of the money for the FHA program.''

Even the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program testified before the Financial Services Committee last week that it was ''somewhat shameful'' how the administration has mishandled this program. Those are his words, not mine. And, finally, FHA Administrator Stevens also testified before that committee last week that ''these new loans may perform worse than refinanced loans that were not previously underwater.'' In other words, Mr. Stevens' statement indicates that many new loans made under this program for underwater loans are far less likely to be repaid, which will weaken the FHA Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund, hurting other taxpayers and other potential homeowners and exposing them to an even higher risk.

As a result, this program privatizes profit, socializes losses, and at its foundation, this program appears to be built on a misguided economic principle of income redistribution, leaving other taxpayers and future generations to hold the bag with interest.

In testimony before the Rules Committee yesterday, it was mentioned that the private sector, the private mortgage industry, has on its own and without any interference by the Federal Government worked with troubled borrowers to refinance over 3 million loans in order to keep these homes from foreclosure.

So there clearly appears to be a far more effective private sector solution to this crisis than to inject a layer of Federal Government regulation and spending through this expensive program.

We must have the courage to admit when a program is ineffective or too expensive or based on wrong-headed principles of subsidizing personal greed and irresponsibility. With our Nation itself underwater with monstrous debt, passage of this bill to terminate this expensive and ineffective program is a step in the right direction.

It's a good and fair rule. It opens it up for anyone to have access to this bill, and a good underlying bill, and I urge their adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah for the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, now more than ever it's critical that we focus our efforts on creating jobs, continuing to stabilize our economy and the housing market, and I am happy to say there's some good news on that front.

Just last month, Mr. Speaker, it was reported that we added 192,000 jobs and that unemployment dipped below 9 percent for the first time in almost 2 years. We're talking about private sector jobs. This was due in part to the recovery efforts that were passed in the 111th Congress and signed by the President.

Now, however, instead of building on the successes of the previous Congress and introducing legislation to continue this economic growth, my colleagues are seeking to pull the plug and return us to policies that got us into this economic mess. Instead of talking about on the floor of the House creating jobs, the Republican leadership is focused on repealing the Patient Bill of Rights; passing H.R. 1, a spending bill that Chairman Bernanke stated will kill 200,000 jobs over the next 2 years; and now removing critical support for homeowners who are struggling to pay their mortgages in this tough economic time.

H.R. 830 is more of the same. At a time when housing markets are beginning to show signs of life, signs of recovery, my Republican colleagues want to eliminate programs that keep families in their homes and protect communities from the crippling consequences of foreclosures.

Democrats want to empower homeowners to get their debts under control, not undermine our economic recovery for political gain. It's critical to preserve the American Dream by keeping families in their homes and out of shelters and unemployment lines, and preserving the integrity of neighborhoods that suffer when homes are foreclosed upon.

Repealing the FHA refinance program would empower collection agencies and municipal eviction squads rather than empower hardworking American families who are suffering in this difficult economic climate or are victims of lenders that created financial products through the housing crisis that led to reckless lending.

The bill we have before us today would be harmful to middle class families who are struggling to stay in their homes. Middle class Americans hurt by this bill are exactly the people we should be protecting in this Congress as we start to build a stronger and more stable economic future for our country. Instead, we saw that this House has raised their taxes with the passage of H.R. 4, and now the Republicans are threatening to remove working families from their homes.

Mr. Speaker, we do all agree that this Nation needs to get its fiscal house in order and resolve the housing crisis. But this bill, an outright repeal of the FHA program, is not the right approach. A strong rebound in the housing market is critical to our economic recovery, creating jobs and ensuring that our banks remain stable.

A good indication of the housing market is the amount of delinquencies or the number of mortgages that are at least 30 days late on their payment. According to Jay Brinkmann, the chief economist for the Mortgage Bankers Association, the latest delinquency numbers represent significant across-the-board decreases in mortgage delinquency rates in the U.S. More importantly, loans that are past due by 90 days or more fell 28 percent.

It's clear that through programs like the FHA short refinance option, which the Republicans are trying to eliminate, we have begun to stabilize the housing market while helping Americans pay their mortgages and stay in their homes. These numbers coincide with signs of a recovery in the job market, and now is not the time to abandon the program.

The FHA refinance program allows people who have mortgages that are worth more than their homes to refinance to a more affordable FHA-insured mortgage. This program allows lenders to write down at least 10 percent of the outstanding principal to help bring monthly payments down to affordable levels. According to CoreLogic, in December of last year, about 22½ percent of all residential properties with mortgages were underwater. We are no stranger to that in Colorado. Many homes in Adams County and Boulder County are underwater. These distressed mortgages pose a threat to our economy and the integrity of the banking system. We can't risk another housing crisis and banking crisis by removing programs that help keep families in their homes and keep the homes out of foreclosure.

My friends on the other side of the aisle will argue that this program has fallen short of its original goals. I

agree that this program is not perfect. Instead of scrapping it entirely, we should work to strengthen it, build on success, and figure out how best to resolve the housing crisis this Nation faces. We need to mend it, not end it.

□ 1330

Until just recently, many homeowners weren't even able to partake in this program. Borrowers had difficulty finding banks that had the capacity to refinance under the stringent guidelines of this program. But recently, we've had some good news. Two major banks who underwrite many loans in Colorado, Wells Fargo and Allied Financial, announced pilot projects that would allow underwater borrowers to refinance under this FHA program. By adding these two giants to the mix, the FHA Refinance Program will begin to grow and prosper while it continues to add more banks and increase accessibility. Terminating this project now would result in many families losing their homes and would be a tragic mistake.

Mr. Speaker, banks support this program; homeowners support this program. It's critical that we all allow this program the chance to succeed, rather than make arbitrary budget cuts rather than help struggling families.

This program does not bail out individuals who made mistakes, who made poor decisions, who bought houses they couldn't afford or are looking for a way out of foreclosure. It's not a program to protect vacation homes or megamansions. It's not a free line of credit for anybody. This program is a helping hand to the many hardworking Americans who are in a difficult spot, individuals with good credit scores who can help themselves and the banks who hold their mortgages by participating in this program.

In my home State of Colorado, almost 20 percent of all homes were in negative equity. This means about 220,000 families in Colorado are stuck with mortgages that are worth more than their homes. According to The New York Times, ending this program would squander an important chance to prevent foreclosures. In addition, Mark Fleming, the chief economist at CoreLogic, stated, ''Negative equity is a primary factor holding back the housing market and broader economy.'' With so many families underwater, it would be irresponsible of us to eliminate this program and unnecessarily put more Americans at risk of foreclosure.

Mr. Speaker, to date, not a single mortgage that has been refinanced through this program has gone into default. The majority of costs associated with this program occur if these FHA-insured mortgages go into default.

Now, there's no way my friends on the other side of the aisle can call this a waste of taxpayer money because it has yet to spend $1 of the funds it was allocated. In fact, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act that Congress passed and the President signed last year requires all unused funds from the program to be returned to the Treasury.

By strengthening this program, improving this program, we can continue to keep Americans in their homes at a minimal cost to taxpayers. Mr. Speaker, we must improve this program so we can keep families from defaulting, strengthen the economy, save taxpayer dollars, and stabilize the real estate market.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the sponsor of this bill who has found a program that flat-out doesn't work, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD).

Mr. DOLD. I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding, and I certainly want to take this opportunity to outline what this program has been.

It is undeniable that this program has been what anybody that looks at it can say is a failure. It doesn't work for the homeowners; it doesn't work for hardworking American families that are paying taxes; and it doesn't work for future generations, children and grandchildren that will certainly be burdened with an enormous debt that the government continues to heap on them.

If I can, I will just go back. As a small business owner, I employ just under 100 people—for me, that's 100 families. And I do stay awake at night trying to make sure that these families have the opportunity to put food on the table and provide an education for their children. But one of the things I have learned in business is the fact that you have to recognize when something is not working. This is an instance of something not working in our government.

Let's go back down to just the raw basics. Let's look at the facts of this program. While well-intentioned, the program facts are simply these: We have obligated $8.12 billion out of TARP funds. We have disbursed $50 million. Fifty million dollars has been disbursed, and yet in the downturn we have seen that what should have been—what, $1.5 million is what the administration is saying, the number of homeowners that are coming into this program? We've seen 245 applicants in the last 6 months, 245 applicants. Out of the $50 million disbursed, we have received 44 loan modifications. Just doing the quick, back-of-the-envelope math, $1.1 million per refinanced loan. The average loan is $300,000.

Now, I have to tell you, for the American public, for future generations, that is not a good use of the American taxpayer dollar. We can and must do better. There is no question that there are good and laudable programs out there that we need to be financing. This is not one of them.

Let me just say again that this doesn't work for the homeowners themselves. Why are there so few in a downturn? I would argue because many of the homeowners recognize that this is not a program that they want to be involved with. You can't be engaged in this program if you, first of all, have any equity in your home. You can't be engaged in this program if you're delinquent on any one of your mortgage payments. There are a whole litany of things that prevent you from getting into this program. But if you do get into this program, your credit will be decimated for years to come. The average credit score, according to the experts, is 711. Well, it won't be 711 for long as soon as they take this and get access to this program.

The question is: Will it reduce your monthly payments? Well, after going through this, the homeowners actually have to pay the closing costs, then they have to actually purchase private homeowners' insurance, the mortgage insurance. The chance of them actually reducing their payments is actually not that great. So they're going to go through the hoops and the pains to not reduce their monthly payment. Again, this is not a win for the homeowners.

It's also not a win for the taxpaying American families; $8.12 billion obligated. We have to go in and look at this. When you tuck your children in bed this evening, ask yourself: Is this in the best interests of the future generations? Is this the best use of our taxpayer funds?

We have to be truthful with the American taxpayer. We have to be truthful with the American people. That's what you sent us here to Washington to do is to look you in the eye and be truthful with you. This is a program that doesn't work. That doesn't mean that we don't want to help out homeowners. We do not want to be wasteful with your tax dollars. We have to go back to the drawing board because right now this absolutely is a program that, by all accounts, has failed.

So when you look at your children and grandchildren, know that we can and must do better. I think that we have an obligation to ask ourselves, when we look at the American family: Is this the best use of our resources? Is this the best that we can do? I don't believe that it is.

As a small business owner, we make mistakes. We're going to make mistakes here in this Congress. How will we be judged? I hope we're judged on the fact that we can admit when we've made mistakes and try to then go back to the drawing board.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to take a strong look at this, to know when something is not working. We have refinanced literally millions of mortgages in other vehicles. Out of the 6 months that this has been alive, 44 mortgages at the tune of about $1.1 million for the disbursed funds into this FHA Refinance Program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 830 and support this rule.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would venture to say that if we went to a mall this afternoon in our country, or a diner, or some other place where people gather—maybe people waiting outside of school to pick up their kids—and said, ''What would you like to see Congress work on this week?'' I think most of them would say, ''Why don't you work together to create an environment where small businesses and entrepreneurs can create jobs, because there are 15 million unemployed Americans and we need to put people back to work.'' Others of them might say, ''I'm concerned about educating my children. I have college-age children, and I'm looking at the cost of paying for college education, and I'm extremely concerned I'm not going to be able to educate my kids.'' Others might say, ''I'm worried about my parents. My mom or my dad live with me and their prescription costs are going through the roof and it's a major problem for them. I'm worried about health care for my parents.''

□ 1340

I'm sure there are some—there are many—who would say that they're worried about wasteful government spending, that they do want to see this government not waste their hard-earned money. And I guess there are some who would say there's this mortgage program that's been running for a couple of months, and I really think you should do something about that and get rid of it. There are some, and there will be debate about the merits of doing that.

But if we look at the record of this majority, 10 weeks of hearing those concerns and they are 0 for 10. Ten weeks, not one bill about jobs. Not one idea about jobs, not one effort to create an environment that small businesses and entrepreneurs would thrive in, and this is week number 10 and not a word.

Earlier, in the last debate, the gentleman from Texas said that the Republican job plan was to repeal the health care bill. That was their jobs plan. Well, that ignores the reality that since the health care plan was enacted, about 1.4 million jobs have been added to the economy, almost a quarter of a million of them in health care itself. So that's their jobs plan.

Their education plan is to go to a woman who's working part-time, raising children and trying to go to school, and reduce her college scholarship by $845, so that she probably has to either stretch the years in which she's in school or throw in the towel on her education altogether.

Their education plan is to take 10,000 reading teachers out of America's classrooms and 7,000 special education teachers out of America's classrooms. That doesn't sound like a very educated education plan to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentleman.

And, frankly, as far as the price of health care is concerned, if they succeed in repealing the health care bill, the price of prescription drugs will go up for people's moms and dads, not down. Jobs. Ten weeks. No plan. The cost of education. Ten weeks. A bad plan that raises the price of education. The prescription drug problem for seniors. Ten weeks. A bad plan that raises the price of prescriptions for seniors.

A lot of Americans would probably say they don't like the idea of paying $4 or $5 a gallon for gasoline at the gas pump. No plan from the majority. So we'll have a debate on the merits of this bill; but with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, this is the wrong bill at the wrong time. The American people want us to work together to create jobs, make education affordable, and make health care affordable, particularly for senior citizens in this country.

The majority is 0 for 10. Let's make this week the one that we break their losing streak and work for the people of our country.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. It is my honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and in support of the FHA refinancing bill that is one of four bills that will be on the floor coming out of the Financial Services Committee on which I serve that is terminating programs that will literally help people stay in their homes and help in the economic recovery.

My Republican colleagues are proposing to terminate these programs, but they are not putting forward any alternative to help these people stay in their homes. There are nearly 11 million homes that are underwater now, meaning that the value of the home is less than the loan the homeowner has taken out to pay for it. Seven million homes have been foreclosed on so far, and another 3 million are expected to be foreclosed on through 2012.

This vote will be on continuing the refinancing of FHA loans that will keep people in these homes, keep these homes filled so that they're not eyesores or pulling down the economy in certain areas.

Last week, Citibank, Wells and GMAC voluntarily came forward and said they intend to participate in this program. It's a voluntary program. These are three of the largest mortgage companies in the country, and their participation will certainly broaden the reach to help more people.

The program allows borrowers to write down at least 10 percent to reduce the debt burden. Then standard FHA loan terms will apply. As with all FHA-insured loans, the property must be the homeowner's primary residence, and the borrower must meet the FHA's full documentation. And they must be current on their mortgage.

With declining home values, borrowers are caught in mortgages that they can no longer afford because their rates have reset or because their interest-only payments have not allowed them to grow any equity in their homes. They are making their payments—but barely. This is an important program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. MALONEY. States across the country have this challenge. As I said, almost 11 million mortgages are underwater, or 22 percent of all outstanding mortgages. By passing this bill, we are saying that we have no solutions for these homeowners. It is not good for the homeowner, not good for the economy, and certainly not good for our country.

President Obama has issued a statement that he will oppose the termination of this program and indicated that he will veto it when it gets to his desk. But I urge my colleagues to join me in vetoing this rule and vetoing the underlying bill in order to help our economy and to help homeowners stay in their homes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate listening to the gentlewoman's discussion of the bill actually at hand, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, at the end of this debate I will ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question so that I can offer an amendment to bring up H.R. 964, the Federal Price Gouging Prevention Act.

I am honored to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question and against the rule. Not only is the majority passing up another opportunity to finally put forward a bill to create jobs; they are using the underlying bills to make it even tougher on American families, in particular, tougher on middle class homeowners. Further, it is clear, as the gentleman from New Jersey suggested, that Republicans have no plan for rapidly soaring gas prices, another threat to middle class families and to our economy.

The Department of Energy forecasts gas prices could spike to a national average of more than $4 a gallon for regular this summer—about 50 cents higher per gallon than Tuesday's national average of $3.50. In my district of eastern Long Island, regular unleaded has already surged by 34 cents in the last

month alone and now averages $3.74 a gallon. In the east end of my district, it's already well over $4 a gallon. And AAA projects gas prices could reach 50 cents higher per gallon by Memorial Day.

The Republican response: silence. Instead, we will vote today to kill a mortgage assistance program for the struggling homeowners and the recently unemployed. That is why my colleagues, Congressmen MCNERNEY, WALZ and MCINTYRE, and I have joined in introducing the Federal Price Gouging Act to take on this new threat to our economy. Our legislation gives the FTC the authority to investigate, enforce, and then to punish price gouging and market manipulation.

I urge my colleagues to join us in standing up to the oil companies and show hardworking Americans that we are in their corner. Vote against the previous question which, if defeated, would allow the House to consider this important price gouging measure. Now is the time that we must act to prove that their interests are paramount, not the oil companies' or the bankers'.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, while it has been over 2 months, we have yet to pass a single piece of legislation that promotes job growth in this country. My friends across the aisle repeatedly speak of their mandate to create jobs; and yet instead of listening, the Republicans have focused on bills that will hurt the middle class, disempower the middle class, and, in this case, force more Americans into losing their home.

The Republicans have been talking about repeal and replace. Yet so far all we've seen is repeal, no replace. It's not as if there aren't many viable alternatives when we discuss health care reform. There was discussion, well, what do we do with people that have preexisting conditions? There was an enormous leap of faith with regard to repeal. Oh, we'll get to it someday. Oh, we'll get to it someday.

We're hearing the same thing here. It's not as if these viable alternatives, the replace part, are a mystery. In fact, in the 111th Congress I introduced H.R. 4877, which would have provided a capital gains tax waiver for private investment in community banks, giving local banks sorely needed capital to lend to homeowners who needed to be rescued, to shore up their balance sheets, to encourage primary offerings of equity in the private sector.

□ 1350

My bill would allow Americans to invest directly and profit directly from the economic recovery. I plan shortly to reintroduce this bipartisan bill, and I hope to see an outpouring of support from those who have called for repeal so that there is a replace component to what we actually do need to do as a country to mitigate the housing crisis and stabilize real estate. Republicans and Democrats alike should be interested in free market alternatives that don't just reduce taxes to revitalize the housing market, but can eliminate them.

Mr. Speaker, instead of scrapping this program, we need to have a solid response to the housing crisis in this country. We welcome suggestions from Republicans, independents, all Americans to improve this program to make it accessible to more families. No program is perfect when it's created. And the FHA refinance program has shown that it can successfully keep families in their homes when given the chance. Our recovery is just beginning and it's fragile. We need to provide stability and predictability with regard to the Federal policies in this area.

This is just another example of a broken promise, a repeal without a replace. And it is leaving what is fundamentally a critical public policy issue, on which Democrats and Republicans agree, namely, the stabilization of the housing market, without any answer. And even a partially correct answer, Mr. Speaker, is better than no answer. So I hope that the work proceeds to replace; but in the meantime, repealing without knowing what comes next is an enormous leap of faith that could cost too many middle class families their home, which is why I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide that immediately after the House adopts this rule it will bring up H.R. 964, the Federal Price Gouging Prevention Act. This bill, introduced today by my colleague, Mr. BISHOP of New York, who we just heard from, would crack down on gas price gouging during international crises affecting oil markets, preventing sellers from taking unfair advantages of circumstances with prices that are unconscionably high.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with the extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question so we can take up a bill that will help, rather than hurt, struggling families. I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I close with some trepidation, as I heard the debate today about continuing resolutions, health programs, teachers, gas prices, and capital gains. But let me risk something and actually talk about the bill at hand.

First of all, it's an impeccably good rule, which allows an open amendment process for anyone who wants to think through an amendment and prefile it. Not a gotcha amendment, but a real amendment to this bill. It's a good way of handling the situation on the floor. I am very proud of the Rules Committee for presenting this type of a rule.

Secondly, you have heard from the sponsor of this piece of legislation the details that are required of this particular program, which discourages those from actually using it. So that the CBO would say that if we continue this program, which is not actually attracting any takers, it would cost the Federal Government at least $175 million in failed mortgages, defaulted mortgages.

In addition, this is one of the programs that we are talking about mandatory spending, not discretionary, but actually doing something about mandatory spending. And in the terms of the Inspector General, this program has failed. We can do better. And as a government we ought to do better than this poorly planned, poorly executed, underutilized, and very, very expensive failed program.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 150 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, 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. 964) to protect consumers from price-gouging of gasoline and other fuels, 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. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and Minority Leader or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. 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. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 2 of this resolution.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote

against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 150, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 186, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

YEAS—235

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
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
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
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
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
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
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
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)

NAYS—186

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
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 (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
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
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Costa
Ellison
Giffords
Gohmert
Graves (MO)
Hastings (WA)
Hinchey
Honda
Hurt
Reichert
Royce

□ 1419

Messrs. FRANK of Massachusetts, PASCRELL, ACKERMAN, and Ms. BASS of California changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, on March 9, 2011, I inadvertently missed rollcall No. 165. Had I been present I would have voted "no."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 180, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

AYES—240

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cooper
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
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)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
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
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
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—180

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
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 (GA)
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)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Akin
Cole
Giffords
Graves (MO)
Herrera Beutler
Hinchey
Honda
Hurt
Lankford
Luetkemeyer
Marino
Reichert

□ 1426

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.

Stated for:

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 166, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. ADAMS). The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan, and their families, and of all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROSKAM. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 326, noes 91, answered "present" 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 167]

AYES—326

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.

Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rehberg
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
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
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—91

Altmire
Andrews
Bachmann
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Brady (PA)
Burgess
Butterfield
Capuano
Cardoza
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Costa
Cummings
DeFazio
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Donnelly (IN)
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fudge
Gardner
Garrett
Gutierrez
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Heller
Hinchey
Holt
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Keating
Kinzinger (IL)
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lynch
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
Moore
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Poe (TX)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Renacci
Richmond
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Sewell
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Stark
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tipton
Visclosky
Walden
Wu
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—14

Boustany
Dold
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Graves (MO)
Honda
Hurt
Lummis
Michaud
Pence
Reichert
Smith (NE)
Whitfield

□ 1435

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 9, 2011, I missed rollcall votes Nos. 165, 166, and 167 to attend to a family matter. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 165, "yea" on rollcall No. 166 and "yea" on rollcall No. 167.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mr. HINCHEY, New York
Mrs. MALONEY, New York
Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
Mr. CUMMINGS, Maryland

APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN MEMBERS TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH REMAINDER OF 112TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 9, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JERRY LEWIS, the Honorable MAC THORNBERRY, the Honorable FRED UPTON, the Honorable ANDY HARRIS, and the Honorable FRANK R. WOLF to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through the remainder of the One Hundred Twelfth Congress.

JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

PROTECTING AND DEFENDING THE RULE OF LAW IN DOMA

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, what happened to the rule of law?

Last week, the U.S. Justice Department announced that President Obama would stop defending the Defense of Marriage Act. I remind you that the President took an oath to protect and defend the Constitution.

The Defense of Marriage Act became law in September 1996 to solidify traditional marriage within Federal law. The President now abandons the defense of this law, claiming that no reasonable argument can be made to demonstrate that the law is constitutional—a position many legal scholars have ridiculed while pointing to a wealth of legal authority, including to relevant Federal case law.

So it appears that, not only is the President substituting his power and judgment for that of the Congress when it comes to a number of bold administrative measures to write law from the Oval Office, but he is now substituting his power and judgment for that of the Supreme Court. It appears to me that President Obama sees no need for the other two branches of the Federal Government.

PRESIDENT OBAMA ENFORCES THE LAW ON DOMA

(Mr. NADLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NADLER. I hadn't planned to speak except I must rebut the nonsense we just heard from the previous speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has a duty to faithfully execute the laws. He is doing so. Though he doesn't agree with the Defense of Marriage Act and though he doesn't think it's constitutional, unlike President Bush, who refused to implement and to enforce the laws he thought were unconstitutional, President Obama is enforcing the law. He is simply not urging it in court. That's his prerogative, and that's his duty if he doesn't think it's constitutional.

The fact of the matter is, given Supreme Court precedent on the standards to use in defending a law that discriminates against people, he had no choice because, when you have a group that is discriminated against and that inherently in its characteristics is not politically powerful enough to protect itself, the precedents all say you must have heightened scrutiny.

That is what the President is urging in court. He is enforcing the law, and he is doing exactly what he ought to do.

SOMBER ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL GUARD PLANE CRASH

(Mr. RIGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the anniversary of the single largest loss of members of the National Guard since World War II.

Ten years ago last week, the Virginia Beach community and, really, the entire country suffered a tremendous loss when 21 National Guard members perished when their helicopter crashed in southern Georgia during a rainstorm. Eighteen of those members were from Camp Pendleton's Red Horse Guard Unit in Virginia Beach, and it included my good friend Paul Cramer.

My constituent Elayne Schmuckler reached out to our office to share her brother's story. Richard's honorable legacy lives on today, as does the legacy of every guardsman who perished on that flight.

My thoughts and prayers are with the families today on this somber anniversary. The selfless service of their

loved ones and their service to our country will not be forgotten.

May God bless them and comfort them.

□ 1440

END THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Today, a bipartisan coalition of Members of Congress have introduced a privileged resolution calling for a vote in this Congress to end the war in Afghanistan. More than 60 percent of the American people want us out of there. This war is already approaching the cost of a half trillion dollars. We have Americans who are losing their jobs; their wages are being knocked down. We have Americans losing their homes, losing their retirement security. They can't send their kids to the colleges they want, and we're spending all this money on a war that is a waste of time, money, blood, and treasure to try to prop up a corrupt regime in Afghanistan. Our occupation over there is fueled in insurgency.

It's time for Congress to take its constitutional responsibilities under Article I, section 8. We haven't really done that with respect to Afghanistan. It's time for us to do that. Let's have an up-or-down vote. That's what this resolution is about.

I urge all Members of Congress to consider supporting the privileged resolution that ends the war in Afghanistan.

THE BUDGET BATTLE

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, what is the budget battle about? It is about our country; it is about our kids; and it is about our freedom.

Imagine if you were borrowing 40 cents for every $1 that you spent in your household. You would change your purchasing habits. That's what this battle is about.

Do we want to leave to our children a legacy of billions and billions of dollars in debt which they owe to China? That's what this budget battle is about. This is very important stuff.

We have to put the politics of spending and positioning and about being Democrats and Republicans aside. We've got to do what's best for the next generation, not the next election. We need to come together and come up with commonsense solutions, because you and I as Americans, we can do better and we deserve to give our children better than what we're doing right now.

WHAT ABOUT JOBS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUELSKAMP). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, today we want to talk about jobs. The people in my district, the 10th Congressional District of California, in Concord, Antioch, Pittsburg, Fairfield, Livermore, they want jobs. They want to go to work. They want this government to create jobs.

We are now in the 10th week of the new majority, the Republican majority, and thus far there has not been one significant, useful job bill brought to the floor. Instead, we had a CR brought to the floor that, in all probability, will cost America 700,000 jobs. That's what the CR, the first piece of legislation introduced by the Republicans, would do, 700,000 jobs. And it's all across the board: construction jobs, research, manufacturing jobs, education.

We just heard one fellow stand up here on the floor and say he was worried about his children. He should be, because the bill that he voted for less than 10 days ago will destroy thousands and thousands of teaching jobs across this Nation, including 218,000 young children that will not be in the Head Start program. We can't afford that kind of a ''jobs'' program.

Joining me today is BETTY SUTTON from the great State of Ohio, in the heart of the once very strong manufacturing base of this Nation.

Ms. SUTTON, if you would tell us what's going on in Ohio and how you see these issues.

Ms. SUTTON. Well, I thank the gentleman, and I thank you for your leadership.

Boy, that poster says a lot: GOP continuing resolution destroys 700,000-plus jobs, possibly yours. And where did we get that number? Before we get to Ohio, where did we get that number? We got that number from a number of places. Ben Bernanke said that the plan would cost hundreds of thousands of jobs. The GOP's CR, according to Goldman Sachs, would reduce economic growth by 2 percent and cause the unemployment rate to increase. And a study by the International Monetary Fund concluded that the idea that fiscal austerity stimulates economic activity in the short term finds little support in the data.

We have a group of 300 economists, including two Nobel laureates, who wrote a letter warning that the shortsighted budget cuts to ''human capital, our infrastructure, and the next generation of scientific and technological advances'' would threaten future economic competitiveness as well as our current recovery.

So that's where we begin. Despite all of this forewarning about what this path will lead us to, we still see a continuing resolution that indicates we're going to lose 700,000-plus jobs.

In the State of Ohio, I'm sure that a number of people, most of the people out there, have seen at the statehouse where we're witnessing democracy in action, at least from the outside, because for a while there the statehouse doors were closed when all of the workers and fair-minded Ohioans descended upon our State's capitol to protest against what the Republican Governor there is trying to do to public sector workers.

Under the guise of taking care of our deficit, an attack on workers' rights is being waged not only in Ohio but across this country, from Wisconsin to Ohio to the floor of Congress where we've seen attack after attack. And it's really a sad thing, because we all know we should be focused—and the other side should join us in focusing—on priority one, which is putting people back to work.

In Ohio, the key to our budget problems is more people working than you have revenue to pay for the public services and the public sector employees who help to make our world turn. Can you imagine the idea?

It was not the workers in Wisconsin or Ohio or across this country that drove our economy off the cliff. It was not those teachers or those firefighters who rush into those burning buildings when we run out of them. It was not the police officers who are out there on our streets protecting us and keeping our communities safe. It was not the workers.

The workers are not the problem. They are part of the solution of where we need to go. But the bottom line is we need to be focused on creating jobs. And it's just amazing that not only are our friends across the aisle, the Republicans, not interested and focusing on that—10 weeks on the job, zero jobs—they're actually looking at cutting those people who do have jobs, their rights. It's just fundamentally unfair and it's counterproductive.

We all know that we need to trim back our budget. We should always be willing to trim back the budget, but only by engaging in smart cuts, not just indiscriminate cuts.

What happens when a person doesn't have a job? What happens when 700,000 people don't have a job? Do we think they just disappear, that they are no cost to our government, to our country? Not to mention the loss of dignity and the loss of opportunity, everything that our country stands for, having a chance to make a way for your family, to feed your family and take care of your family.

□ 1450

It's a crazy idea to say that we can make cuts that cut hundreds of thousands of jobs and somehow that will lead us to prosperity.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And reduce the budget deficit.

Our President in his State of the Union said that we have to out-educate, out-research, out-manufacture and out-build the rest of the world. Yet the first significant piece of legislation

that the Republicans moved through this House goes in exactly the opposite direction. It does in fact reduce the education. I guess 20,000 or 30,000 teachers are going to lose their jobs. Kids will not be there.

But the thing that really struck me—we were talking earlier with my colleague from Maryland about this—is the research. In the area of research, which are tomorrow's jobs, what does this CR do? What does the Republican Caucus want to do? They want to cut back on the research. You're looking at a significant number. I think it's over 5,000 key researchers.

Could our colleague from Maryland share with us her experience and her knowledge, because you are in one of the research centers.

Ms. EDWARDS. I want to thank the gentleman from California for bringing this to our attention. I've been thinking a lot about the role of research and development to the 21st century and to 21st-century job creation. In fact, I've introduced along with you and a number of our colleagues, my colleague from Maryland, Republican ROSCOE BARTLETT, H.R. 689 which is the 21st Century Reinvestment Act. The goal is to invest in research and development, expand our tax credit for research and development, make it permanent, and then link it to manufacturing.

Here has been my experience. In the Fourth Congressional District, we are home to some of the most fantastic research innovation that's happening anywhere in the country. That's true all across the country, but these sorts of robust and innovative firms, many of them are small firms. They can't afford to just front-load R&D to create manufacturing jobs, but they need the government to have a tax policy that actually encourages that. So I am all in favor, actually, of a tax policy that encourages the positive things that we want, research and development, job creation, manufacturing.

Instead, what did we get out of Congress? We got a tax bill that rewards the top 2 percent with tax breaks that they're never going to put back into the economy. We've had 10 weeks of a Republican revolution here in the House of Representatives that has created zero jobs, and, in fact, a continuing resolution out of this House of Representatives, this Republican-led House of Representatives, that would destroy 700,000 jobs. It is as if we're saying, No, we don't really like the 21st century. We want to go back to the 19th and the 20th century. That is not how you rebuild a manufacturing base in this country.

I have actually been struck traveling throughout my congressional district at small firms like Wabtech up in Gaithersburg, Maryland, which is doing some really innovative R&D, research and development, to develop signaling systems that will help us with high-speed rail. Guess what: they've just had to lay off workers because we are not making the right kinds of investments into research and development and technology that's about jobs for the 21st century.

The President got it right. He said we have to out-innovate, out-educate and out-build. The way that we do that, of course, is to invest in our educators; invest in our young people. We're doing exactly the opposite. The Republican majority is doing the exact opposite here in this Congress. Again, 10 weeks of work and not a single job.

In fact, Congressman PETE SESSIONS from Texas has just said: you know what, we're not going to create a jobs bill at all. We're not interested in jobs. All we're interested in is cutting government spending.

Well, let's look at what they're cutting, some of the most innovative research that's going on in this country. NOAA, that looks at our weather service, that makes sure that our farmers understand what's happening with our climate and our weather so that they can engage in production of products throughout this country.

What else are we doing? They say the National Institutes of Health doesn't need $2.5 billion to continue innovative research in cancer and other things, things that actually play out in terms of the marketplace, creating private sector jobs in a new economy.

I am really struck by the language of small business, the language of innovation, the language of job creation but not a single job. Zero jobs. Ten weeks of a Republican revolution, zero jobs; 700,000 jobs lost.

I would urge my colleagues that if they really want to be about the 21st century, then they should join us in expanding the research and development tax credit so those innovative firms can invest in all the technologies of the future, so that we can produce the Ph.D.s who are needed to conquer the 21st century and then link that to manufacturing so that the small firms in my district and all across the country can take advantage of a research and development tax credit because they are making things, where, making it in America.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If America is going to make it, we must once again make it in America. Manufacturing matters, and the first step in the manufacturing of this century is the research. It's the well-educated workforce that's capable of doing the new things and the research that goes with it. You are very fortunate in your district to have some major research facilities. NOAA and NASA are in this area. In my own district I have the Lawrence Livermore labs and, adjacent to it, the Lawrence Berkeley labs and the Berkeley campus as well as the University of California-Davis campus where research is what it's all about.

In the continuing resolution, 700,000 jobs. That's a big number, and we just don't focus on that. But we're talking about real people. This is the job next to you that's going to be lost. Sandia Laboratories was in my office no more than an hour ago talking about research for nuclear power and how we're going to deal with that. I told them if the Republicans get their way, 5,500 researchers at the national labs are going to lose their jobs. So what of tomorrow's energy systems? $1.7 billion would be taken out of the Department of Energy's future energy research. So solar, photovoltaic, advanced biofuels, the research for tomorrow so that we can actually wean ourselves from foreign oil, gone. Gone.

You go, What is this, just a feeding frenzy? Is it wise? Is there any real thought put on this? I think the answer for me is no.

I notice that our colleague, new to the House but not new to the issues from Rhode Island, has joined us. How does this affect Rhode Island? What does this mean to your State?

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman from California for organizing this Special Order. I'm new to this Chamber, I've been here 2 months, but I think the poll that was released today, the Bloomberg poll released this morning, again found that America's top priority is jobs and getting people back to work.

We've been here 10 weeks and the Republican-controlled Congress has presented zero jobs. It hasn't presented a jobs bill. It has presented a spending plan that will cost 700,000 jobs. That's an analysis done by respected economists across the country.

Rhode Island is a State that has a very rich manufacturing history. We are the place where the Industrial Revolution began, home to some of the greatest manufacturing. I think, like many States, we have suffered in this recent economy. Rhode Island has been particularly hard hit. But I think if we are going to remain a world economic power, we absolutely have to make things again in America. If you ask people who believe that we're losing that position as a world economic power, you ask them, who do they think is the world economic power, they say China. If you say, why China? They say, because China makes everything.

I asked my constituents during my campaign, go into a store in Rhode Island, try to find something made in America. It's almost impossible. I really hope that the 112th Congress will be the Congress that revitalizes manufacturing in America. That means working hard to be sure we have a national manufacturing policy, to be sure that we provide manufacturers with the tools that they need to compete in the 21st century, to be sure that we have trade policies and workforce investments that allow them to compete globally, and to be really making the kinds of investments in manufacturing that are necessary not only to create jobs in the short term but to ensure the long-term economic health and prosperity of our country.

□ 1500

What I am afraid the Republicans have proposed in their budget proposal,

in an effort to make cuts now, are seriously compromising our ability to lead the world as an economic power. Look, we have to cut spending. We have to be responsible about managing this deficit. But we have to do it in a smart and strategic way that protects our investments in education, in innovation, in science and research so that we can make the new discoveries, develop the new products, and then manufacture them and lead the world as an economic power.

This is an opportunity to really understand the urgency of supporting manufacturing so that we can start making things again in this country, start selling goods. That's how the middle class was built in America, was through manufacturing. That's what built this country, a strong middle class. And the ongoing decisions that have been made by my friends on the other side of the aisle are undermining the middle class, are weakening the ability for manufacturing to grow. And I think they are the wrong decisions for our country.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much for the perspective from Rhode Island. I was, years ago, on the Blackstone River, which I think was the heart of the Industrial Revolution here in the United States; and they were using water power for the mills at that time. A fascinating, great history. And now the most advanced technology is also done in Rhode Island, a lot of it having to do with the construction of submarines and the like. Very, very advanced. But all of that comes from the research, the engineering, the STEM education: science, technology, engineering, mathematics.

I would like to turn back to our colleague from Maryland. I see that she has a few more thoughts. She was kind of anxious to get back into this discussion.

Ms. EDWARDS. I want to thank you, Mr. GARAMENDI, because I am excited about the prospect of manufacturing again in America. In my home State of Maryland, about 40 percent of our economic base was manufacturing. Today, that's under 10 percent. And I think that that's a sign of what's happened all across this country. But it doesn't have to remain that way.

Today, we heard the Prime Minister of Australia express a belief in America that I want America to express in herself in terms of us leading the world in technology development and manufacturing for the 21st century. We need to return to that. There is still a lot of innovation that's going on.

But let me tell you what's happened over the last couple of decades. The United States used to have the number one research and development tax credit in the world. Today, we're number 17. From number one to number 17. And what that means, when you begin to lose ahold of your innovation and other people are doing that innovation, pretty soon the production lines move to where the innovation is taking place. So it's no accident that manufacturing is leaving to where some of that innovation is taking place in other countries. I want to make sure that we're doing it, that we are making it, that we are manufacturing it right here in the United States.

Let's take solar panels as an example. All of the great solar technology that we have developed right here in the United States. Where do we make solar panels? Every place else, particularly in China. Well, we should be making those in the United States, production lines and manufacturing lines that are actually close to where the research and development is taking place. We can go industry by industry, sector by sector and make the argument for making it in America. We are great innovators.

But we don't want to be at number 17 when it comes to incentivizing through our tax policy good things, incentivizing innovation and manufacturing here in the United States, creating local jobs. I mean, the couple of firms that I talked about, they have 200 employees. And, you know, some of those employees graduated high school and they're working on that production line, high-paid jobs working on that production line. They're working alongside engineers who have Ph.D.s, and there are researchers with their Ph.D.s all along that production line, a couple of hundred employees. Well, we should be doubling and tripling that all across communities across this country so that we're not at 10 percent of manufacturing capacity in my State, but we're at 40 and 50 percent, because then people are working, they've got good job jobs, they've got great education, and we are making it in America.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let me pick up a couple of the themes that you hit upon. One of them, continuing on with research in this area of this part of the country, and certainly in the San Francisco Bay area, where I represent, health care research is huge. It is an extraordinarily big part of the economy, both the research and then the spin-offs from it. We call this the biotech. And this is almost entirely health care-related biotech. We also have the biofuels, again coming out of research.

The Republican continuing resolution reduces funding for the National Institutes of Health by $1.6 billion. We are talking about 25,000 health-related research projects that will either stop, be delayed, or pushed off the track—25,000. We're talking about things that are really serious to us: heart disease, diabetes, cancer, all of the things that affect every American and literally everybody in this world. The research would be slowed down, stopped, and in some cases terminated as a result of the feeding frenzy that went on here on this floor where more than 400 amendments were considered with very, very little thought.

Our colleague BETTY SUTTON talked about, yes, cuts, but be smart with your cuts. Don't just take whatever is on your mind, whatever the latest sound bite is, because it may have a very detrimental effect. You are looking at in this case the National Institutes of Health. Human health. Our well-being as Americans; and that means 25,000 research jobs would be terminated.

Now, the press doesn't follow the details. The press follows the game. Is the Senate going to act, or will we have a government shutdown? That's an interesting game. But underlying those will-they won't-they issues are the issues of what actually is in the legislation; and this particular piece of legislation, 700,000 jobs, critical needs that we have as human beings for health, jobs that we need in the future, whether they are in the science field, in the manufacturing field, and jobs for today in the construction industry.

Pulling money out of construction for infrastructure; programs to provide clean water for our communities—thousands of those programs will die as a result of the Republican continuing resolution which is now before the Senate. Hopefully, the Senate will be wiser than what happened here on the floor. We can go on and on.

I developed a list, I call it the dirty dozen, and these are specific things, education, I know that's a big thing in your district, University of Maryland, I think it's adjacent to your district, but you claim it, don't you?

Ms. EDWARDS. Well, let me just go, because I am having a conversation this afternoon with the president of the University of Maryland. I was out at the University of Maryland campus over the past weekend. Like campuses all across this country that are engaged in some of the top-notch research that's going on in the country, I was with 300 young people from kindergarten to 12th grade over at the University of Maryland, all interested in the STEM fields, interested in science, technology, engineering, and math, interested in making a career in those fields that are about the 21st century.

Sadly, here we are in the United States Congress completely disconnected to communities, completely disconnected to young people and their aspirations for the future, cutting, slashing, burning, cutting programs that are about educating our young people to take advantage of the 21st century.

And so it just seems that there is a complete disconnect between what the majority is doing and how that will play out for our future. And so I had to say to these young people, you know, stay with it. Stick with those STEM fields, with the science and the technology and the engineering and math. Go on to that engineering school, go on into the biosciences that we see coming out of the University of Maryland, go on into the space program because we are investing in technologies not just that are going to open up our universe, but that actually have real application here on Earth.

We have to continue to support our young people to do that. But it really does fly in the face of what's actually being done by this Republican majority to cut away at education for the future, to say we don't really want to manufacture things here in the United States and say that we don't really care whether we make that research and development tax credit permanent so that small firms can innovate and create and hire.

But we know that America cares about those things. That's why it's important for us to have this conversation with the American people about what it's going to take, really, to jump-start the economy and the things that are happening in this Congress that are going to put a kibosh on that.

□ 1510

Cutting 700,000 jobs, zero jobs created in 10 weeks of this Congress, and not investing in our future, not investing in our manufacturing.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Precisely so.

At the University of Maryland, I suspect it's similar to what I found in the California State University system, which is the largest university system, they would argue, in the world. We may want to find out what China's actually up to, but it's a huge system.

The Pell Grant is a critical element in providing the opportunity for students to stay in school. Yet the continuing resolution supported by the Republicans here on this floor, and now over in the Senate for consideration, would drastically reduce the Pell Grant by some $870 per person at the same time that the tuition at all of the universities is going up, literally making it very difficult for tens or hundreds of thousands of students to stay in school, and these are the future workers in the high-value jobs that we need here in America.

So, it's not just the higher education and the Pell Grants that are being cut, but at the beginning, the Head Start program, we're talking about young children who do not have an opportunity because of their family's poverty to get started in education, a proven program that actually works. Now, not every Head Start program—and last year, we put together a program to weed out those that are not successful and bring in new ones that would be able to replace them. But 218,000 young children from impoverished families are going to be thrown off of the Head Start program, not next year, but as soon as this continuing resolution becomes law. We can't let that happen.

So we will fight. Firstly, and hopefully, the President, should this somehow pass the Senate and come back to this House and be passed, the President should veto it because I know that he wants to out-educate, out-build, and out-innovate every other country in the world; and you cannot do that unless you have a highly educated workforce soon and later, beginning with those children in the Head Start program.

Now, this is a program in your year that I understand that is important to you.

Ms. EDWARDS. Just yesterday, educators from my congressional district were here on Capitol Hill. They were educators from Bowie State University, an Historically Black College that is now poised to get research grants going to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, cut by the Republican majority in the continuing resolution.

There were representatives here from the University of Maryland. I've spoken again about the wonderful work that they are doing in cyber security, in aerospace research over at that university campus, cut in this continuing resolution.

There were educators from our community colleges that are training both young people and people who want new and real skills for this new economy, cut in this continuing resolution.

And you spoke about the Pell Grants. What these universities and community colleges share in common in higher education is that they know that in order to bring up the most diverse workforce, a trained and skilled workforce, we also need students who come from vulnerable families, whose families can't afford to send them to school. And what have we done? We've cut out of that continuing resolution, the Republican majority has cut $845, $870 from Pell Grants. And you know what that means? That's books for a semester, not even two semesters but, you know, probably a semester.

And so I have to wonder what the majority is thinking about the future. They may be thinking about today, maybe—and we can argue about that—but they surely are not thinking about the future by cutting education, by not investing in manufacturing, by not investing in research, by not investing in all of the things that will make us competitive for the 21st century.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We kind of bracket the United States here. We've got the east coast with Maryland, and I'm out on the Pacific coast, but somewhere in between I believe is the State of Colorado, and I noticed our colleague from the State of Colorado was standing over there, and he had that ''I've got to get involved in this'' look. Please join us and share with us Colorado, which has some of these programs and is very, very important to all of us.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Well, your point, to my friend from California, is that manufacturing matters and having jobs in America matters, that, you know, if we make it in America, we will make it in America. Our focus should be on providing good jobs here with good infrastructure, whether that's education, highways, transit, energy, in this country so that, for ourselves, our kids, our grandkids, there's a prosperous future.

But the Republicans completely missed that entire approach, and I liken it to this. Everybody says let's look at this as if it's family and a family has to tighten its belt sometime. No question about it, but let's really look at what's occurred here and talk about the country as a family, because we are all in this together. You know, sometimes we can do something by ourselves, but most of the time we're in this together.

So what's happened here, let's look at it, is at the beginning of this century, back in 2001, 2002, the country took a voluntary pay cut. When the tax cuts under Bush came down, the country took a voluntary pay cut. So then the next thing that happens is, besides taking a voluntary pay cut, that family or that person goes out and he builds two houses. We went to war twice in the Middle East to the tune of who knows how much money, but at least $1 trillion. So now we've taken a pay cut. We are building two houses——

Mr. GARAMENDI. Two wars.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Which are two wars, and all of a sudden the breadwinner has a heart attack. And that's what happened in the fall of 2008 when we had the financial crash. So no income or lower income and lots of hospital bills. And those hospital bills came in the form of unemployment insurance, COBRA for health insurance, and all sorts of things designed to keep the country moving forward despite the financial crash.

So now, just as the person begins to recover, the breadwinner recovers from the heart attack and is starting to earn a salary again. Hospital bills start dropping, but you still have hospital bills to pay. My friends on the Republican side of the aisle said, Wait a second. We should pay them all right now.

No question that they have to be paid, but you've also got to get healthy. And just as we're starting to add jobs in this country, just as people are starting to get back to work, my friends on the Republican side of the aisle want to blame the debt of this country not on the voluntary pay cut, the tax cuts, not on the two wars, not on the financial crash. They want to blame it on Head Start. They want to blame it on energy efficiency. They want to blame it on education.

Those are the kinds of things that make the patients stronger and healthier and this Nation stronger and healthier so that we can have jobs here, so that we can build things here, so that we can have a prosperous future for ourselves and our kids.

And my friends on the Republican side of the aisle are so misdirected on this that it's scary, and Americans should really sit up and take notice that their future is really being put to the test by the approach that the Republicans want to take to balancing our budget and to building our future.

With that, I would return the conversation to my friend from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let's continue the conversation for a few moments here.

Presumably, these cuts were made to deal with the deficit. We've got a deficit problem. Thank you so very much for going back to the history of how we wound up with this huge deficit problem. It did begin in 2000 when the Clinton administration left office.

The projection for the decade 2000 to 2010 was there would be a $5 trillion surplus, $5 trillion surplus. Based upon the policies that were in place when Clinton left office, 2001, $5 trillion surplus, literally paying off all of America's debt—gone, history.

What happened? How well you said it. Two tax cuts that were not paid for that cut the revenue of the Federal Government. Two wars, Afghanistan and Iraq, not paid for. First time in America's history that we went to war without having some way to pay for it, that is, some tax policy to pay for it. And then on top of that, a Medicare program, the drug benefit, again, a hundred billion dollar program, not paid for, and then the heart attack.

□ 1520

The crash of the world economy was caused by excess Wall Street exuberance. In many cases, that exuberance was fraud, misdirection, and the collapse of the financial industry taking down the world economy and our economy.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. And to that point, the financial heart attack that this country suffered and the world suffered, now the country starts to get back on its feet. Under Barack Obama, on March 9 of 2009, 2 years ago, the President had been in office for 1 month, we hit the bottom of the stock market. It had fallen some 6,000 points in the last months of George Bush. Since President Obama came into office, the stock market has gained 6,000 points. Almost 2 years ago to the day, the stock market reversed itself under his leadership.

Now, part of that is we put some police back on Wall Street, not in an excessive way, but in a way to make sure that investors and people dealing with the financial industry were getting a fair shake. And confidence has been restored to some degree in the financial industry.

Now my Republican friends, that's another place they want to cut. Let's take the cops back off the beat both on Wall Street as well as all across the country. Again, a very wrong-headed move to build the future of this Nation.

I would like to do just one other family analogy if I could. So we've had this tremendous fall. The family has got to manage its expenses. It needs to get its income up, and it needs to manage the expense side. So what we have is, say, okay, we got Aunt Maude, she's in a nursing home. We've got Nephew Joey, he's in a preschool down the street, and we've got Uncle Rex who is an oil company executive. And we've been helping all of them. We've been helping Aunt Maude. We've been helping Nephew Joey. And we've been helping Uncle Rex.

Well, under the Republican approach, they want to kick Aunt Maude out of the nursing home. They want to make sure there's no preschool for Nephew Joey, but they want to keep sending the check to Uncle Rex.

We're all in this together. If we want to manage this deficit, if we want to pay down the debt, we are all in this together. And the approach that they've taken just doesn't make sense.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If we were to look at the proposal that President Obama put forth in his budget that came out about a month ago, he put forth a program that would hold government expenditures at a 5-year freeze, that is, no increase, but they're being able to continue to pay for those necessary programs for Aunt Maude and for Nephew Rick—was it Nephew Rick?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Nephew Joey.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Nephew Joey. It was that other uncle that was making off like a bandit.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Uncle Rex.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So that was to freeze the level of expenditure and to put in place tax policies so that your oil company executive would begin paying a fair share, rather than getting a very significant tax break, beginning to pay their share back into this economy.

Over time, and this was about in 7 years, the percentage of the GDP, the gross domestic product, that was to debt, or to the deficit, would fall from around 11 percent down to about 3 percent, so that it would be managed over time.

Going back to your analogy, you've got all of those debts built up during the 2000 to 2010 period or 2008 period, and then, taking time, 6, 7 years, to bring it back under control, not with the kind of chaotic cuts that are now being proposed by our Republican friends where we would actually slow down the economy, throw some 700,000 people out of work, reducing tax revenues, increasing unemployment, unemployment expenses go up, hospital, emergency room expenses go up because people no longer have health care, and on the other end, people losing their homes. They don't have a job, you can't pay the mortgage, you're going to lose your home, so the housing market would also be hit as a result of the proposal that actually passed this floor with Republican support. I think there were only three or four Democrats who voted for it.

We need to have a wise policy. We need to make cuts. To be sure, we need to make cuts. And I want to put one example on the table here before we go any further and people think that we're not supporting cuts. We asked last year the Congressional Research Office, a nonpartisan group, to take a look at governmental programs and to tell us where the duplication is, where the unnecessary programs are in governmental programs.

That report just came out yesterday. And I was thumbing through it quickly. I don't have it in front of me, but I was going through it. And what struck me was that most of the duplication, most of the unnecessary programs and the waste turned out to be in one Department of this government. It happens to be the Department of Defense. No surprise. No surprise. Duplication, unnecessary expenditures and line after line after line came up that that's where we should be focusing. There are other programs, to be sure, but the big bucks, the big dollars were in the Department of Defense.

Now, it is pretty well known, certainly in my district, and I'd like anybody else to know, that I think this war in Afghanistan ought to end right away. That's $120 billion. Let's just say we leave behind in Afghanistan for social and economic development, to deal like a laser on al Qaeda, the real terrorists that may be there and in Pakistan and in other places, let's just say we can take back $100 billion. That happens to be $40 billion more than the continuing resolution that was put forth here. I don't want to get too far off track, but that's a lot of money. And ultimately, we're going to leave, and they're going to go about doing what they need to do over there. But we need to focus on the terrorism and focus significantly like a laser on that.

Maybe I got a little bit off track with it, but if you want to save $100 billion, there's $100 billion.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Please.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. So I just say to my friend from California, just going back to my analogy, or my metaphor, of voluntary pay cut and then all of a sudden you're building two houses after you just took a voluntary pay cut, being the two wars, but the good news, but there still is much work to go, is that the war in Iraq, we had 150,000 people there. Under the Obama administration, that's been drawn down to about 50 and is shrinking, we're saving already $100 billion a year there alone. Obviously, you've got to look at Afghanistan and a continued drawdown because that's money that could go towards not increasing the debt, but ultimately reducing the debt.

The other thing is that the best way to shrink the deficit, just in that same analogy I was giving, is to put people back to work. The more people that are working, the better off we are. We are in this together. That's the whole point of this. This country's motto is ''e pluribus unum,'' from many one. We're in this together. Big guys, those guys making a lot of money, God bless them. The little guys who are working their fannies off, God bless them. We are in this together. And the only way we deal with problems in this Nation is when we deal with them together.

And this country is a great Nation. We will solve these problems. There will always be problems in the future, and we just take them one at a time as they come. We can do this. We will do

this. We will have a prosperous future for all of us. But we've got some work to do right now.

And my plea to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle is don't cut off the Nation's nose to spite its face. We can take care of these responsibilities and pay these bills. That's what America does. It pays its bills. We need to do it in a sensible way and not cut out the future and the opportunity that so many Americans get from their education, from the infrastructure that needs to be rebuilt, and from making things here in this country.

□ 1530

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am delighted to hear the gentleman from Colorado's perspective.

Two things immediately on my mind, and I see my senior colleague from the great State of New York has joined us. I will call on him in just a second.

One of the things that we are focused on in the Democratic Caucus is making it in America, rebuilding the manufacturing in America so that America can make it. Manufacturing really matters because this is where the middle class is. This is where the middle class jobs are, when you couple that with the power of the unions to make sure that working men and women, the middle class, get a share of the wealth that is generated when we manufacture things.

Some what is going on in the Midwest, in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Ohio, and other States is really important in making sure that the wealth that is generated in this Nation is available to everyone in this Nation, particularly those people who are making things in America once more. Wouldn't we all love to go into a Target store and find on every shelf ''Made in America.'' Chinese, fine, you guys are doing okay. But I want those things made in America.

Two pieces of legislation that I have introduced, along with many others that my colleagues have introduced, simply say if it is our tax money that is being used to support, for example, solar, photovoltaic systems, the wind turbines, the biofuel systems, if it is our tax money that is being used for the production tax credits or to subsidize the solar cells on your house, buy American-made cells. Buy American. That is American dollars. Use that money in America.

Similarly, you and I, we are paying 18½ cents on every gallon of gas to support traffic, to support highway construction, buses, trains, and light rail systems. Our money should be used to purchase trains and buses and light rail systems that are made in America.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Would the gentleman yield one more time?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Certainly, and then I will turn it over to Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. On that point, you raise a great point. Here we are finally making some real progress on energy efficiency and renewable energy, and we know that you have to have the whole menu of ways to power this country. It's oil and gas; it's going to be carbon-based fuels; it's going to be nuclear; it's going to be renewable energy and energy efficiency. But under my Republican colleagues' plans, we are going to go right back to where we were as we start to see gasoline starting to go through the roof. So we are always going to be at the whim of importing oil.

I mean, I feel like sometimes my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, their mantra is: Let's export jobs and import oil. It's just wrong. It's wrong for this Nation. It's wrong for the future, for our future, and for our kids. We really have to be focusing on that. This Nation needs to come together because we can build that better future together and not just doing some of the I think knee-jerk things that the Republican Party has requested of the Congress. It is bad for America. It goes way too far, and I know we can do better.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. RANGEL, please join us here.

Mr. RANGEL. Well, thank you so much. I was in my office doing a lot of work, and I couldn't figure who you people were talking about; it must be some foreign enemies of the United States that really were not supporting the things that, as far as I am concerned, it just makes common sense. It's just a patriotic agenda. It's just something that if America has given us the opportunity to get to where we are, and our parents are where they are, it just seems to me that we cannot afford to talk like Democrats and Republicans. We're talking about America, an America that can be and continues to be a beacon for countries all over the world.

You mentioned manufactured, made in the United States. I remember I was on a trade mission in the Caribbean and there were some difficulties some Members had about whether or not we should give preferential trade to these small countries. My contribution was I just walked around everything that was in the places where we were. The corn flakes came from the United States. The cars came from the United States. The lamps came from the United States. The furniture came from the United States. Doing trade with them meant we were encouraging our base to do what we do best, and that is to make things. So it just seems to me that when we get a flicker of hope coming out of Detroit—and, oh, my God, Detroit, when I was a kid after World War II, I really thought I was in heaven to see middle class people with cars and little boats and kids going to college, and their parents never dreamed it. But they were making things. They were making money. They were investing in our future.

And now that they're coming back, I cannot see why any police cars, fire cars, commuter cars, anything, how we can say that—we ought to go to Detroit first before we go to Tokyo, before we go to Taiwan and all of these other countries. It is the sense in saying that you made an investment in a country that created an atmosphere that makes us all proud.

To me, I like fighting Republicans. I mean, it's what the country should be all about. And I have been here for four decades. It has been exciting. And people said, well, didn't this happen in 1994? No; we fought then, but we were still friends. We didn't have people putting down our country. We had different ideas how to reach the same objectives. We were concerned about jobs always, but also education, also health care.

It's inconceivable how anybody, Republican or Democrat, can cut programs when, if you go into an emergency ward in a hospital, they don't ask for your voting card. They don't ask whether you are a Democrat or a Republican. If you are laid off, and you go home and you have to tell your wife or pull your kids out of school, the loss of self-esteem, the loss of the security you have, the embarrassment that you are going to lose your house, nobody asks, are you a Democrat or Republican, are you liberal or conservative. And it gets contagious as to what happens in one block when a house is foreclosed. Then it happens in a community, and then is happens to America. And that is what is happening today. It is happening to our country.

And so it seems to me that when people have campaigned and said that they want to stop spending, they want to stop borrowing and they want to raise revenue, they want to balance the budget, that's not Republican, that's American. But where do you ever get the concept that just stopping spending in certain areas, it means that you have savings? I mean, you can cut someone's foot off, but still you're going to have a problem with the rest of the economy. And if, indeed, the specialists, Republicans or Democrats, economists can tell you, that their H.R. 1 continuing resolution is going to lose 700,000 jobs, how in the world could we not debate that? How in the world can we not discuss that?

How can not a group of Democrats and Republicans say, well look, we made these campaign promises. They were ridiculous. We really believe we ought to make sensible cutbacks. Let's see how we can cut back without causing more economic problems for our country. Let's see whether or not the environmental problems still are going to continue, whether or not health problems are still going to be there.

And my God, education. Education, the United States of America. Education has been the key to opening the doors for imaginations to capture the entire world. And you don't have to have any bad feelings about other people in other countries; it's just that we're so used to being proud as Americans. We're so used to saying that if

it's made in America, it must be better. And what we're not used to is asking for handouts. And what we're not used to is having people say that they're not going to help us with unemployment insurance when we didn't want that, we wanted employment. And they say no, they can't even give us assistance while we're waiting for a break.

Right here in America, there are so many people who have lost their jobs. And do you know, JOHN, those jobs will never be there for them because productivity, technology, has closed the opportunity. My God, they have to be retrained; and they reach a certain age where retraining is not even an option.

□ 1540

For our young people to go to school or for them to continue to believe in their communities, in their families and in their country, you've got to have training and education to find out what the demand is going to be. It won't be the same demand that we had, perhaps, when I was a kid or when my parents were kids; but there should be great opportunities in the greatest country in the world.

Make no mistake about it: We are not broke. We are not broke. We did not get into this thing in a Democrat way or in a Republican way. People made big, big, big mistakes, but it wasn't the guy working on the job or the guy in the union who made the mistake. It wasn't that we overcompensated public employees. They didn't cause this deficit.

It just seems to me, JOHN, that we shouldn't have to have this debate on this floor. People listening ought to recognize that cutting billions of dollars of resources and causing pain to our young people and to our senior citizens is a campaign promise that shouldn't have been made and that certainly shouldn't have been carried through.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If the gentleman would yield, first, thank you so very much for joining us and for bringing a perspective of four decades of extraordinary work here on the floor and in the committees, for keeping us on track, and for keeping that vision that America is a great place. Americans are strong and resilient and really want to improve their positions and, even more so, want to improve their children's positions. Therefore, the key investments that we must make for today and on into the future are pretty straightforward.

We need to have the best education in the world. We've got a long way to go. We're not going to get there by eliminating Head Start, by eliminating the Pell Grants, by forcing kids out of school, by shutting down classes or by taking classes from 20 to 35 kids. That's what my daughter faces. She's a second-grade teacher. She now has 33 kids in her class. She'll probably have 35 in a couple of months. She had 20 last year. We can't improve the education system. Research. That's tomorrow. Research is tomorrow. If we don't do it today, we will lose this.

Already I'm getting companies coming to me, saying we have to improve the research. We have to have that research tax credit because what's happening is the manufacturing isn't in America—it's overseas—and now the research is following the manufacturing. We've got to turn that around. Yet the continuing resolution cuts research: energy research, research in manufacturing, research in health care.

So where is tomorrow?

Tomorrow is going to be overseas unless we return it to America with smart investments in the future: infrastructure; transportation, moving people here and there; information infrastructure. The continuing resolution cuts infrastructure. Those are ''today'' jobs that give us the future. We can go on and on here, but we are nearly out of time.

What I would ask my Republican colleagues is to put the feeding frenzy aside and to sit down and look at what really can be cut without harming the future. We can do this. We can make it once again in America if we use our tax policy wisely, if we use our tax money to support American-made products—buses, trains, solar cells, wind turbines. Our tax money should be used to buy those pieces of equipment that are made in America.

Mr. RANGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I would love to yield to you anytime.

Mr. RANGEL. Just on what you were talking about, the tax policy, and knowing that the top 1 percent of the wage earners, or the income people, in this country own 40 percent of the Nation's wealth. The President of the United States has to go to the United States Chamber of Commerce and remind them of the hundreds of billions of dollars that taxpayers have given to them so that they will be able to survive. Yet they won't take a gamble with their country in terms of helping us in partnerships to create the jobs that we need so badly. If we cleaned up the Tax Code, we could find so much that we could reduce the rates and make certain the incentives that we have would be to encourage people to invest in the good USA.

So let me thank you so much for the contribution you're making. To me, anyone watching this ought to throw away Republican and Democrat ideas and try to find out what's good for our great country.

Mr. GARAMENDI. This is a great country, and we're going to have a great future. We're in tough times right now, and we've been in tough times in the past. But if we have wise, thoughtful policies, we'll pull this country together, and we will deal with the deficit. We just can't do it in ways that are not wise and that do not give us the investments for the future.

I think our time has expired. Thank you so very much for joining us. Thank you for your years of service to this Nation as a Member of Congress and as a war hero. We thank you.

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you for your great contribution.

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

THE CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CARTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate being recognized.

In 1994, when the Republicans were placed in control of the House and Senate, they produced a magnificent piece of legislation, a legislative weapon against the overreaching of government. This was done in the Clinton administration, and it was signed into law by that President. This weapon hadn't been used but once during the Clinton administration and not at all during the three GOP years of President Bush.

What it's called is the Congressional Review Act. This is an act that requires all Federal agencies to submit any new major regulation to the United States Congress for 60 legislative days prior to its enactment, during which time the Congress can vote to block these new rules if the Congress sees fit.

With Mr. Obama in the White House and Senator REID still throttling back in the Senate, the Congressional Review Act gives the House the potential to block or at least to expose the outrageous new rules being promulgated on the American people. These were done by the entrenched leftists in the Federal bureaucracy, and they are controversial rules that cost Americans jobs.

If there is one thing that the American people have told us they are most interested in, besides the fact that we are running away with spending in this Congress, it's that they want jobs. You can do whatever you want to a family, but if you give a family a job, that family has at least the security of that employment. Since by that very destructive nature these regulations have the potential, rather than to create jobs, to destroy jobs, they should be seriously looked at by this House of Representatives.

One of the things that people don't understand about how the Federal Government works—in fact, we had this said to us all the time—is ''you passed X law, and it's really affecting and hurting my business,'' when in reality the law, itself, may not do any harm to one's business at all. The regulations, though, promulgated by the authority that has been given rulemaking power on that legislation have the effect of law. Yet they're not passed by this

Congress. They're passed by the various agencies and bureaus of the country when the Congress gives them regulatory authority.

Now, if you really don't know what's going on here, you may ask: How important is that? Well, let's just take a look at last year.

Last year, the Federal Government issued a total of 3,316 new rules and regulations, which is an average of 13 new rules a day. Seventy-eight of those new rules last year were major rules. The definition of a ''major rule'' is a rule that may result in having an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more—a major increase in prices or in the cost to the consumer. It may have a significant effect on the economy, including employment.

□ 1550

The ObamaCare bill, which was passed by this Congress in the last session of Congress, the health care bill, it arguably is the mother of all rule creators. The Congressional Research Service reports that ObamaCare gives Federal agencies substantial responsibility and authority to fill in the details of that bill and of that legislation with subsequent regulations. There are more than 40 provisions in the health care bill—that is called the overhaul bill—that requires, permits or contemplates Federal rulemaking authority just in that one act of Congress. Forty different agencies can create rules that affect the health care of every American citizen. This House can fight back on those rules with this Congressional Review Act.

Now what is the Congressional Review Act? As I said, they filed this with the Congress. And then for 60 legislative days—and ''legislative days'' has a definition. A legislative day is a day that this Congress is available to act. So if the Congress recesses for 3 days, those 3 days are not counted in the number of days. So it's not 60 calendar days; it's 60 legislative days.

For instance, if you look at the last Congress, rules that were filed last summer, last June, in fact, which would be more than 6 months from the 1st of January, those rules are still available for review. Now, how is that possible? Well, between the 1st of June and the end of the year, this legislative body was not in legislative session 60 days. We had the longest recess in probably the institute of the Republic that took place in August because of the political world that the majority saw itself in and the fact that they felt like they needed to have 6 weeks back home to do the politics. So the majority gave us the long recess. We had a break in the 4th of July week. Then we came back for 2 weeks. Then we went back home for campaigning. And then we came back, after campaigning, in December for 2 weeks. So, in total, we didn't reach 60 legislative days. But all that counting starts over with a new Congress.

Something that most Americans don't know is, every time we have a new Congress, everything starts over. So when we wrote rules for 2 years ago that governed this body, we had to write new rules for this session of Congress. At the end of this 2-year period, we will write new rules for the next session of Congress because we are required—you've heard it's a new world every morning. Well, at least for Congress, it's a new world every 2 years because the nature of our very existence is we are the people's court. The House of Representatives is the people's House, and the people's House changes depending on who gets elected every 2 years.

So now we have started a new 60-day period. The 60-day period, the rules that were filed that would be subject to this Congressional Review Act, those rules were all filed on the 15th of February because that was the first time that both Houses were completely in session. And so these things will expire sometime in June. After that clock has run, then this House can no longer act. So the House has, right now, during this period of time, from February to June, to act on a lot of regulations. This gives us a chance to make a determination.

This is kind of the Congressional Review Act right here. I want to give you some examples of some kind of rules that are available to be dealt with under the Congressional Review Act and will be dealt with under the Congressional Review Act.

The FCC has proposed rules that would allow the Federal Government to act as a gatekeeper and prohibit broadband providers from selectively blocking or slowing Web traffic. These new FCC rules will restrict access to the Internet and stall innovation in our country, further damaging the economy and hindering job creation.

Most people think the Internet works pretty good right now, but there are those who think the Federal Government should intervene in the Internet and the agency in the executive branch should have a chance to actually regulate and decide how the Internet is going to operate. We can't affect the Internet worldwide, but we can affect the Internet in the United States. Most of us feel that we should not, in fact, be intruding on the Internet. This is now coming up for disapproval under H.J. Res. 37. GREG WALDEN is carrying the ball on this, and that clock expires on the 14th day of June.

The NESHAP rule for Portland cement manufacturing. What is Portland cement? Portland cement is that bag of powder that you mix with gravel and so forth to make concrete. That's what Portland cement is. Portland cement is manufactured in the United States and manufactured all over the world. There is a regulation which would require the closing of 18 cement plants in this country. These jobs from these cement plants, as a result of the regulations that are being proposed, would be forced to move to India and China if they wanted to continue to produce Portland cement because they would not be able to meet the standards that would be established by this rule.

The U.S. cement industry today provides more than 15,000 highway jobs, with an average compensation of $75,000 per year, along with allied industries that account for nearly $27.5 billion of the gross domestic product. A statement made by the concrete industry is that there is only one element in the world that is more prevalent in construction than concrete, and that's water. You have to realize that the second element most important to construction around the world is the production of cement, the production of concrete, and water is the only one that's more important. It's a pretty amazing amount of concrete that is required in the world; and yet as a result of this rule, there is a distinct possibility that we will be looking at about 70 percent of our concrete manufacturing being done outside of our country.

Now, there has been a lot of criticism of this challenge to this rule because people are saying, but look, these cement manufacturers put mercury into the air; they don't regulate mercury. Well, I just want to show you something that I think was very interesting when this argument was made.

This map, prepared by the Electric Power Research Institute. Now remember, this is the most and this is the least amount of mercury production on our chart. Now, you will notice that all of the red and these green and yellows here, they're scattered in there, is heavy concentration of mercury in the air. The source of that mercury originates outside the United States.

This is not the result of American production of Portland cement; this is the result of foreign production of Portland cement, because these are regulated industries already in this country and nobody regulates those industries outside of this country. And because of the prevailing winds from the Far East, more than half of the United States has a major mercury output. And the solution is to write a bill that will force more companies to go overseas. That means more mercury will be in the air because they will be sending them to unregulated countries.

This is a bill that wasn't thought out. This rule was not thought out well enough, and so we should stop it. We should sit down and work out a clean air set of regulations that actually work to reduce this mercury production and, in fact, bring more people to producing in this country rather than not producing in this country.

□ 1600

One of the things I hear every day when I go back to Texas is: When are you going to stop outsourcing our jobs to other countries? And yet we're writing a regulation right now under Clean Air that is going to outsource thousands of American jobs to other countries.

This is something that needs to be thought through. Many times these agencies, because they don't answer to the American public in any form or fashion, other than this review, these are things that they need to be sat down and we need to get their heads on straight.

This new rule, we will try to raise this rule. You say, This is how it works in the House of Representatives. How does it work in the Senate? Well, what makes this a really interesting rule is you first need to know what the rules of procedure are in the Senate. It takes 60 Senators to agree to bring anything to a vote in the Senate, which makes it difficult to bring things to a vote when more than half of the Senators have to agree just to bring something to a vote. But written into this act, signed by President Clinton into law, is the provision that this particular examination of rulemaking authority only requires 30 Senators to agree for a vote, that it can be brought to a vote.

So when it passes out of the House and goes over to the Senate, it only takes 30 Senators to agree to bring this to a vote. If it passes the Senate, then it is sent to the President's desk. Then basically he's got the only vote left, in many cases to prevent bad regulations. The President told us the last time he had a press conference that he was going to stop job-killing regulations in this country. The regulations we are going to be working on are job-killing regulations. And so we're going to give him the opportunity to do that. If he chooses to veto it, so be it. Basically, he had the one vote that could have stopped the job-killing regulation.

The Office of National Coordinator for Health Information Technology has promulgated complex, confusing and costly rules establishing what it means for hospitals and physicians to have a certain EHR, whatever that is. I don't know what that is. If not simplified, the rules will prevent health care providers from receiving incentive payments and increase the cost of EHR installations and limit the innovation in the health information technology market.

Another rule that's out there is called the boiler MACT rule. Basically, the Environmental Protection Agency is proposing four separate rules that would establish more stringent emission standards on industrial and commercial boilers and process heaters. The broad-reaching proposals could cost manufacturers over $20 billion in compliance costs and place hundreds of thousands of jobs in jeopardy. This needs to be dealt with by the 21st of June.

The Florida numeric nutrient water quality standards rule. This is also by the EPA, as I understand it. This rule mandates nutrient standards for Florida lakes, rivers, streams and estuaries in response to litigation initiated by environmental and special interest groups. The Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services concludes that Florida's agriculture community will lose 14,545 full-time or part-time jobs and $1.148 billion in sales annually if this rule is approved. This is why this Congress ought to look at this rule.

HHS rule on medical loss ratio requirements under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. This regulation requires all health plans to pay a minimum of 80 percent of premiums toward health services. Larger insurers should pay a minimum of 85 percent. Industry analysis estimates that as many as 47 percent of the participants in individual and small group plans which have higher administrative costs due to economies of scale will lose their health insurance if this regulation becomes law. So this one regulation, which comes out of what we call the ObamaCare bill, could cause 47 percent of the people who have small to midsize health care plans to lose their health care plan.

We actually have a bill that is coming before this Congress. GEOFF DAVIS of Kentucky has introduced this bill. It mandates that all new major rules must be approved by Congress before becoming law.

This one is pretty simple, and it just supplements what we're already dealing with. It uses the same definition for major rules and requires Congress to approve all major rules and Federal regulations before they become effective.

Why would we do that? To start off with, 3,000-plus new regulations were passed last year. These regulations could cause you or others to lose their jobs. And so if it is our responsibility, and I think it is our responsibility in this House, for us to come up with solutions that make jobs be created rather than make jobs disappear, then those things that have a potential to make jobs disappear, it's part of our responsibility to take a hard look at those regulations that might make jobs disappear. This is not rocket science. This is pretty easy stuff.

We who are the people's representatives, who are elected to represent the people of the United States—and remember how our Founding Fathers set up our Constitution: The Senators represent States and the House of Representatives represents people. Our districts are drawn based on the population in those districts. Their district is the whole State, and they represent the State of Texas or the State of New Jersey or the State of New York or the State of California and all the other States. So we are the direct link to the people.

We are the only branch of this House and Senate where no one can sit in these seats and be a Member of Congress unless they were elected. That's something a lot of people don't know. If we should have a Senator, heaven forbid, die while in office, that Senator can be temporarily replaced by an appointment by the Governor of the State that that Senator represents. But if we have a Member of Congress, heaven forbid, die while in office, that Congressman has to be elected before they can serve in the House of Representatives.

We are the people's House. We are the only House that depends upon the vote of the people to keep us here under all circumstances. So if that's how we get here and our responsibility in today's economy is to try to get ourselves out of the poorhouse with all the borrowing we've been doing and to help create jobs so Americans can get back to work, if Americans get back to work, we will have a solution in many instances to the problems that face our country right now as far as debt and other things, because if they are working, they are paying taxes and those taxes will help alleviate the issues we have.

If that's the case, why wouldn't it make just decent common sense that this Congress, the people's House, would have the opportunity to look at regulations that might destroy jobs? And if we have credible people that are saying they will destroy jobs, then we need to look seriously at those regulations. And maybe it's just a matter of killing the job-killing regulations so that we can renegotiate regulations that solve the problem without driving industries overseas or killing the jobs that these industries create.

Sometimes agencies are not putting priorities on people; they're putting priorities on other things. Therefore, we need to examine our priorities. Our job on the floor of this House is to make sure of the safety and welfare of our constituents back home and make sure that we do everything we can to make sure that they've got a job so they can support their families and support themselves.

Right now, with, not 9 percent anymore, 8.9 percent unemployment, which is about as close to 9 as you can get without being there, we are still in an unemployment nightmare in this country.

□ 1610

I can remember back during the Clinton administration when there were public service announcements made that said 5.5 unemployment was full employment for the United States. We later learned that unemployment got down, during the early part of the last decade, to a much, much lower number than that. But we certainly know we cannot continue to tolerate somewhere between the top end of 8 and 10 percent unemployment and expect our economy to be healthy. We've got to get our people back to work. These regulations are part of the issues that are going to be important to discovering the solutions to this problem.

Some would say this is controversial. Some would say that if the Congress interferes with regulatory authority then Congress is going to take on something that by plan was passed out to the regulatory agencies to keep us

from having to work so hard and getting into the weeds on all these bills. I didn't come up here, and I don't think anybody came up here, not to work hard. If they did, they probably don't belong being up here.

If the actions of a regulatory board or an individual that is in charge of a regulatory agency has a dire effect upon the employment of any American citizen, I think we as the Members of this Congress have a duty and a responsibility to at least look at it. If we don't think it's bad, we can vote accordingly. But to just ignore it and let these things be created, and I would argue without a serious due process of law, because the only people that police this up is the various agencies in the executive branch of the government, and it's generally done by career bureaucrats. And they make these decisions. These people don't answer to the American people. They don't go before the American people for a vote every 2 years. Therefore, they don't feel the pressure of the damage that can be done by some of these regulations.

Some of these regulations that are going to come before this House are going to be good regulations, and I would expect them to be voted for and upheld. But if we have the responsibility and the duty to protect our fellows, then I think we should step forward and do that job.

My friend from Florida is here. Welcome. I will yield you whatever time you would like to join me in commenting on this regulatory overreach.

Mr. POSEY. I thank the gentleman from Texas for recognizing me.

I didn't plan to speak today. But I was in my office and I was listening to your explanation of this abhorrent and out of control administrative rules process, where people who are not elected and are not accountable make up the rules as they go along however they may want them to. We have had a number of cases that have injured my constituents, or at least caused them a lot of sleepless nights already.

As you may know, sir, earlier this year the Securities and Exchange Commission exposed their intent now to examine the entities that they regulate not just based on their conformance with securities law, but on their environmental stewardship. Now, these are the same people that couldn't put Bernard Madoff away when they were given an open and shut case 10 years before Madoff basically turned himself in. This is the same agency that hasn't disciplined anybody. Nobody's been reprimanded. Nobody's had their wrist slapped. Nobody's had a day off yet. They can't do the job they are supposed to do now, but they're going to start regulating companies for their environmental stewardship based upon rules that they promulgated. And you're correct that's the wrong thing to do.

Most recently, and near and dear to my heart because it affects so many people in my State, is the new rule the IRS has proposed to deal with banks and foreign deposits. You know, for over 90 years this country has encouraged foreign investors to put their money in our banks. It makes good sense. We have their money, we can loan it out, it creates jobs for Americans. It's a win-win situation. It's a win for them, it's a win for us.

Now, the IRS has decided that they're going to promulgate a rule that says the banks must notify the governments of every foreign depositor regarding how much money they have in our banks. Now, what's the benefit to the United States for that? There is no benefit to the United States. They don't owe taxes in the United States. What's the liability to the United States for that? The liability is that $200 billion to $400 billion will leave American banks and go back into foreign banks.

Now, can you imagine if you were unfortunate enough to be governed by Hugo Chavez, Ahmadinejad, or Castro what would happen if they found out that you had assets in the United States of America? You would not only lose your assets; you might lose your life. But more importantly, this wrong-headed rule would cause a dramatic destimulus effect on our economy when you look at a stimulus bill of $800 billion that basically didn't perform like it was supposed to.

It doesn't make much sense to write a rule that would take $200 billion to $400 billion, up to as much as 50 percent of what our stimulus bill was, out of our economy. The IRS tried to do this about 10 years ago. Over 100 Members of Congress stepped up and said this is a lousy idea, and it needs to be defeated. So my plea today, sir, is that we can have at least 100 Members of this Congress that will again stand up and say this was a bad idea 10 years ago, it's a bad idea now. Let's kill this rule and don't let it happen.

Mr. CARTER. I am glad you brought that up. You know, what's really interesting, Mr. POSEY, is they've got this new rule, I am not sure who promulgated it, that if you are a volunteer on a commission or a board that has anything, any form or fashion that handles money, you have to pay a $600 licensing fee to get a license to serve on the volunteer board. You know, the one that comes to mind is, every city of any size has what's called a planning and zoning commission. I happened to serve as the chairman of that commission in my hometown of Round Rock, Texas. It's a hard job. It's in many ways a thankless job.

But now, in order for a volunteer to come in and serve to decide how the city's going to plan and zone its area for various construction and business, you got to pay a fee to volunteer, 600 bucks. But that's not how ridiculous it is; any board, agency, or commission. And every State has literally thousands of these volunteer positions that people do to help out their State, their city, their county. If there is any form or fashion of bonding capacity for any relative group that you serve, you have to buy a license for 600 bucks because you are considered to be in the investment business.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. POSEY. I thank the gentleman again. You know, many people, even elected people aren't really familiar with what exactly an administrative rule is. We talk about these administrative rules as rules, and people wonder what they are. I used to explain to people that in Florida, where I first got interested in the administrative rule process, all the laws on the books passed by their elected State officials were in four law books this big. They were shocked by that.

They said, well, what about the commercials where we see the attorney in front of all the books advertising for Dewey, Cheatem and Howe? What are all those? Aren't those our State's laws? Yeah, that's last year's edition and the edition before that, and the interpretations of them. But all those rules are in those four books. They are shocked at that.

They said, well, we thought there were a lot more laws than that. I would say, well, there are a lot more laws than that, but those are all the laws that were made by people you elect. The administrative rules are laws which are made by unelected people that you don't vote for. And usually, they could fill up half the room. They would probably fill out a quarter of this room. So that's what most people don't understand, the relatively few laws that are passed by people they elect, and the plethora of rules that are passed by people they don't elect.

□ 1620

I remember it's one of the reasons I ran for the State legislature. I had promised my wife when I got off the city council I'd never run for office again as long as I lived. She made me promise her. That changed, and one of the reasons was I was upset by the runaway proliferation of rules in that State, which seemed like they were making rules willy-nilly that were causing an inconvenience for every business and putting jobs in danger.

So I got elected and, Judge, you know, the first bill I passed made it a third-degree misdemeanor for a bureaucrat to promulgate a rule that wasn't authorized by statute. Of course, people thought I was crazy. A lot of the media made fun of me, and I was the brunt of a lot of jokes.

The Governor at the time had a hit squad go after that bill, and when I had it come up in committee they went around and met every member and said, Kill this bill. But it still got out of committee. So they referred it to six more committees, and we weren't able to advance that.

I struggled with trying to change the way the administrative laws are promulgated and come up with a system

for about 4 years, to no avail. Representative Simler, Representative Pruitt were doing the same thing, and it just seemed like we were getting nowhere. And then in the 4th year, the Governor that had previously seemed so disgruntled with my legislation gave his final State of the State address wearing one of these belts like they wear at Walmart or Home Depot or Lowe's so you don't hurt yourself, and he was holding all the rules that applied to a cook shack that he wanted to build on Chemonie Plantation. And he said, We have got to do something about this out-of-control rules process.

And he gave every member of the House and every State senator at the time a copy of a book by Philip Howard called, ''The Death of Common Sense.'' It is a great book that I implore people to read. It is very short and it is an easy read. It talks about how the rules process has worked to harm society.

You know, Mother Teresa at one time wanted to have a house for the homeless in New York City. She located the perfect spot, got the contractors ready, was ready to open the doors, but the building department said, No, you can't do that here. She said, Why? Because that building does not have enough restrooms. So we have to continue to let the people sleep on the sidewalks and use the street for a restroom because of the rigid, monolithic interpretation of the laws and the rules.

So, as a result, finally, of his personal experience, the Governor said, We need to change rules, the rules procedure, and we did. And you know, we changed the way rules are vetted. There's a joint administrative procedure committee which reviews every rule to make sure there's specific statutory authority to write that rule.

The new process wasn't in order very long before one of the State agencies determined that any land with a new type of fern or fauna on it should be considered a wetland and couldn't be used for any development. Fortunately, it impacted a very large landowner down there who challenged the rule through an investigative court, an administrative rule through an administrative judge. The administrative judge ruled in favor of the bureaucrats, saying the legislature could not possibly have meant exactly what they said. That was the crux of their 38-page decision.

So the next year we passed House Bill 107, which basically said we mean unequivocally exactly what we said, and from a rules perspective the State has lived happily ever after.

Now, Washington is more dysfunctional than I anticipated that it would be when I got here, and one of the worst dysfunctions is the administrative procedures or the administrative rules process here. It's shocking that it's a very old process built on a flimsy foundation. There have been numerous attempts to fix it. None of them have been really successful, and I think, as you and I have discussed before, we need to have total reform. We need to start with a clean sheet of paper, and we need to make the agencies accountable for the rules they write, and they need to be specifically statutorily authorized to do those things.

And so I hope that our colleagues will join with us as we move forward trying to seek an accountability and an efficiency in our government that is greatly lacking right now but is within our grasp.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, we're joined by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), one of our new Members. We're proud to have you.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Thank you.

Mr. CARTER. We're talking about the regulatory overreach of the Federal Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Absolutely. I appreciate the opportunity to be heard, Mr. Speaker.

Under the Obama administration, the executive branch has hijacked the legislative process. The administration is riddled with unelected officials who are regulating the American people. The FCC, for example, the EPA, and dozens of appointed czars have way too much to say. Congress needs to take back the reins on legislating, which is what we were elected to do.

Appointed friends of the President, they don't know what the people need. That's why we have Congress. We were elected to know our districts and represent our districts' needs. That's why I know how detrimental the EPA's regulations are to farmers, for example.

Time and again, the EPA has produced regulations that go way beyond the intent of the Federal law. For instance, the Clean Air Act was intended to keep our air safe and clean, but the EPA has turned it into something it is not: a means to regulate dust. Mr. Speaker, I have actually risen in support of legislation to not fund their ability to regulate dust, and here I am again talking about this very same thing.

I represent a heavily agricultural district in the great State of Arkansas, and the farmers in the First District will tell you this. Food comes from the ground; and in the process of taking it out of the ground, they're going to stir up some dust, and now the EPA wants to regulate that dust. It's a natural byproduct of growing and harvesting crops and has been since man first put seeds in the ground. In order for these farmers to do their job and feed the millions of hungry mouths in our country, they should be allowed to do their job without being further poked and prodded by EPA bureaucrats.

Under the new national ambient air quality standards, the total estimated cost to industry lies near $90 billion a year. A huge portion of this will be a direct hit to our farmers, putting many permanently out of business. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the Clean Air Act was not legislated to put farmers out of business.

Another example of unelected officials missing the mark is EPA's fuel containment regulations; once again, the EPA overstepping its bounds. They want to tell farmers how best to run their farms. Not only does the EPA not trust farmers to run their operations well, the parameters end up costing the farmers tens of thousands of dollars, depending on the size of their farms.

What the EPA needs to remember and understand is that farmers are smart people. It is in the best interest of them to invest in containment berms to ensure the land remains productive. Farmers don't want to spend money to clean up a fuel spill, which is why they already take the necessary safety measures. They shouldn't be forced to spend $10,000 for each containment facility when $1,000 would do the trick. Farmers know best how to protect their own land.

We can't forget to protect the farmers. Folks, if we eat, we're involved in agriculture. There are over 300 million people to feed in America and only 1 million farmers. In fact, out of that 1 million farmers, 250,000 account for 80 percent of the total food production. I know here in Washington we can barely agree on anything. But I think there's one thing we can agree on regardless of our political affiliation, age, race, or gender, and that is: We like to eat. So why are we harming the people who feed us?

We need to bring common sense back to Washington. Quit letting the bureaucrats in Washington run a rice farm in northeast Arkansas, and let them do their jobs.

The Clean Air Act and fuel containment are two solid reasons why the congressional relief act is necessary, and I proudly stand with my colleagues in this effort to scale back rogue agencies such as the EPA in order to restore congressional intent to the regulations that are being produced. No longer should we let the tail wag the dog.

Mr. CARTER. I thank you for your comment. I'm sure there have got to be some people that are listening to this who want to say, Did he really say ''regulate dust''?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Absolutely right.

Mr. CARTER. Yes. There is a proposed rule to regulate dust. Now, that statute actually exists in the State of California, which is closest to bankruptcy of any State in this country. And the Central Valley of California has had an issue about water and the shortage of water in the Central Valley, one of the breadbaskets of the entire Nation, because of a debate over water. Until it started to rain, they've been dry as a powder keg, but they have the dust regulation in California.

So we inquired of them, What do you do if you've got a gravel road going up to your farmhouse to keep the dust down?

Well, we have to water it every day. We have to take this shortage water that we don't have enough to even

grow a clump of spinach, and we water our roads so we don't violate our local Clean Air Act in California.

□ 1630

And I got humorous about that because I went to school at Texas Tech in Texas. And although we have come a long way up on the south plains of Texas in reducing the amount of dust storms that have been up in the panhandle of Texas, we still have dust storms. And when I was at Texas Tech, we had dust storms that were so bad that if you drove into the wind, they would literally sandblast the front paint off of your car. Now I want to know what the fine is going to be and who's going to have to pay the fine when there's dust blowing in all the way from New Mexico and Arizona that comes blowing into your State, and who is the EPA going to punish? I haven't got a good idea. But chances are, the farmer. And that's the real tragedy here.

Certainly there are particles in the air that are bad for folks like me who have asthma, and we have to be concerned about it. And we're not going to let people overproduce any kind of disaster. But to say you can produce no dust on a farm is pretty close to crazy. Just the turn of a plough creates dust. Just the driving of the pickup to the barn creates dust. And I think it's a little overreaching.

I was talking about this $600 fee that you've got to have to be a volunteer. I tried to think of one that everybody might understand, and I thought of a good one. Everybody has got a school board in their State somewhere, a local school board. And generally these local school boards are either wanting to have a tax increase or they are wanting to float a bond issue or something like that. So they create these volunteer groups called ''friends of the school board'' who go out in the community and try to help the school board get this bond passed so they can have better schools for the children of that school district. Everybody experiences that across this whole Nation, and every Member of this Congress probably knows something about that. But under the new proposed regulation, every one of those volunteers that goes out and promotes the bond issue would have to pay a $600 federal fine to get a license to talk about the bond issue, as if they were some kind of financial adviser to the American public. And what we really have there is a new revenue source created by the bureaucrats to put more money in the coffers of their bureau or their agency. That's the kind of thing that makes no sense.

My secretary was bragging on the fact that she thought the county commissioner was going to appoint her to this volunteer board. And I said, well, you'd better get a check ready for 600 bucks. She said, well, no, it doesn't pay anything. I said, yeah, and by the way, the regulation also says that the person, the entity that appoints you to that board, cannot pay your $600 for you. You have to pay it, because you are now a financial adviser because that board has the ability to issue bonds. Now that's just a little bit too much.

I had an old cowboy back in Texas that made a comment to me. He said, we don't have very many shortages in this country, but the one shortage we got in Washington, D.C. is, we have a severe shortage, dang near a drought, as he put it, of common sense. And part of the reason we have the Congressional Review Act is so that hopefully the common sense of the representatives of the people can prevail in these issues that are going to either harm our individual constituents, cost us jobs, or drive industries offshore, overseas, as we did with the cement manufacturers if we impose these severe penalties upon people who produce Portland cement. Portland cement doesn't mean it's from Portland; it means it's the process that they use to make cement.

So today we're talking about what, I think, is something that the American people, now that they hopefully know a little bit about how much the agencies of this country and the bureaucrats and the secretaries and all the people that follow them, of all the Cabinet members in this executive branch, the kind of power they have to change the life of the individual and the life of the job producers and the job seekers in this country.

And if we are going to give them that kind of control and that kind of power over people's individual lives, over the employer's ability to make the profit necessary to hire and create new jobs, if we're going to allow them to have that power, just like anything else, someone has to have oversight over these people and take a look at what they're doing and see if it is to the good of the American people and the good of our country. And that's why we have the Congressional Review Act. And in that Congressional Review Act, we get the chance to look at it. Just because it hasn't been used but rarely does not mean it shouldn't be used when the number of regulations have grown by geometric progressions in the last 2 years.

When we create one bill, one bill, the health care bill that was created in the last session of Congress that creates 40 entities with rulemaking authority, 40 new entities that can create rules that affect the individual life and the health care of the American people—we have one particular entity that will actually be able to say what treatment can and cannot be given to certain people—surely this House would want to at least take a look at those regulations, because it might mean life or death to an American citizen if we do not allow that. So it is important.

Congresswoman ELLMERS from North Carolina, we are pleased to have you here. We would like you to explain what you want to show us here today.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

Today, I rise on behalf of the people of Garner, North Carolina. They are faced with a very difficult situation these days, one that is threatening, and it actually as we speak is basically shutting Garner down for business. As you can see from the chart, I will point out the red line there. That red line is essentially going through the town of Garner, North Carolina. It is an extension of Highway 540. And this is the proposed site from the Army Corps of Engineers. And as you can see, if you look at the chart, there are some other very colorful options to consider as well. However, those options go through areas of wetlands and things, and the area that goes through Garner, North Carolina, that's the option that they are looking at because it's the only option that is outside of any wetlands and out of any areas that would harm such things as the dwarf wedge mussels.

Now, basically, what we are faced with today is a situation where Garner, North Carolina, is shut down for business. Right now, potential businesses wanting to relocate or set up shop or move to the area, individuals maybe wanting to move to Garner, North Carolina, are reconsidering that choice because they see that there is a potential highway going through the center of their community, which is kind of a ridiculous situation. Many of the organizations that are involved right now have all said that this is not a viable option. And yet we continue to look at it. We continue to allow Garner, North Carolina, to be shut down for business, potential loss of jobs. We have individuals that live in Garner such as Brenda and Jerry Summer, who are an elderly couple that have children and grandchildren who have moved back to Garner to be near them, and they have the threat of having that highway go right through the middle of their living room.

We also are faced with a situation where the Springfield Baptist church, which has been there for 140 years, 2,000 parishioners, they will literally lose their church and 50 acres of land. This is continuing because of the Clean Water Act and basically the Army Corps of Engineers' refusal to remove the red line from consideration.

□ 1640

We have met with them. We have asked them to take that option off the table and to save the American taxpayers that expense of doing the study. They know it is not a viable option. They know it's going to hurt business. They know that there are potential other options there, and yet we continue to look at it.

I have the utmost respect for the Army Corps of Engineers but, quite frankly, this is a waste of American taxpayer money and a potential threat to business, and continuing in Garner,

North Carolina, all so that we can preserve a mussel, all so that we can preserve and route around wetlands. You can go anywhere in North Carolina and it is pretty much considered a wetland except your developed areas that are already in progress.

I'm not against the highway, the loop being finished, but certainly there are other options that could be looked at. You can see there is an orange line, a blue line, a pink line. They're all there. They all connect, and these are all viable options.

Some of the other organizations that are involved in this, like the North Carolina Turnpike Authority, have already dropped three other options from consideration because of public protests in those towns about potential harm to the communities. Garner stands to lose a projected worth of $9 million in investments and hundreds of jobs. Investors are literally walking away while the town stands in limbo because of this potential project that is going to take place here.

We cannot continue this. This is what is happening. We must stand for the people of Garner, North Carolina. We must stand for the people of America, who are continuously saying: Let's use common sense. That's the issue here today. Common sense. If we all know this is not going to be the project that's ultimately proposed, let's take it off the table. Let's not spend American taxpayer dollars. Let's preserve the business community of Garner, North Carolina, and all the good folks there who are potentially going to lose their homes. Let's do it now. Let's not wait. This is a ridiculous situation, and I think the American people have had just about enough of it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, so much for allowing me to stand for the people of Garner, North Carolina.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentlelady would yield for a question, if I understand you correctly, the main reason for this route is because of the Clean Water Act and the Endangered Species Act?

Mrs. ELLMERS. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. CARTER. It is a mussel, you're saying?

Mrs. ELLMERS. It is. It's a particular mussel. Let's find the name just so you're familiar with it. It is the dwarf wedge mussel, and apparently that dwarf wedge mussel is found down in the wetlands of the lower area there, so they have avoided that area. And then there are some other wetlands there as well. Certainly there are ways we can work around these issues and not go through an entire town that has been developed for years and years.

Mr. CARTER. This is the town, here, which they are going to go in and condemn basically all of the town?

Mrs. ELLMERS. Go right through, go right through the very middle of it.

Mr. CARTER. Yes, I can see why people are a little upset about that.

Mrs. ELLMERS. And the thing is, there is potential for that highway to go through there, but right now as we speak, the town of Garner is basically stuck. There is no growth. There is none whatsoever because any potential business, any potential job that could be coming there is not. It is turning away from Garner, North Carolina, for this very reason.

Mr. CARTER. I can understand that. So if I am a potential employer who wants to build a factory and that is one of the places I might look at, I look at this and say wait a minute, I can buy the land, build my building, and then here comes the Corps of Engineers which puts the highway right through the middle of my building?

Mrs. ELLMERS. Absolutely.

Mr. CARTER. So the builder says I think I'll wait or look somewhere else?

Mrs. ELLMERS. And they look somewhere else. That is what is happening. This is why the people of Garner, North Carolina, are outraged. And rightly so. This is a situation which has been hanging for awhile. It needs to be addressed, and it needs to be addressed today. I have asked all entities involved, let's all look at this and use some common sense and make the right choices and let's save the American taxpayers some money.

Mr. CARTER. These regulations should be looked at by this House if they are available to be looked at. Of course, some of these may be long since on the books before we had this tool to examine regulations as they come out. But still, it is good for you as the Representative of your folks in your district to come up and speak for the people because that's our job.

Mrs. ELLMERS. It is.

Mr. CARTER. I'm going to reclaim my time because I think we are about to run out of it. I want to thank the Speaker for this hour.

ENERGY FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that the American people are really upset about right now is gasoline is $3.50, and in some parts of the country it is close to $4 a gallon. And the President of the United States and his administration, for whatever reason, is obstructing our ability to become energy independent.

On February 17, U.S. District Judge Martin Feldman, who gave the Department of the Interior information on the deepwater drilling in the Gulf of Mexico earlier, he gave the administration 30 days to rule seven deepwater drilling permits okay, to approve them. He overturned the ban put in place in June of 2010 that allowed the government to arbitrarily impose a moratorium that would cause irreparable harm to businesses along the gulf coast. In fact, it will cost as many as 24,000 jobs. But the thing about it that really concerns me is that we have the ability to become energy independent within a relatively short period of time.

Everybody would like to see us move towards alternative sources of energy and clean-burning fuels to help the environment. I don't think anybody opposes that. The problem is in the process. Do we want to become more energy dependent on the rest of the world?

Now we get between 25 and 30 percent of our energy from the Middle East. Anybody who has been watching the news at all knows that there is a war going on in Libya, Egypt is in turmoil, and Bahrain is having problems. There are potential problems in Jordan and in Saudi Arabia. Now if something goes wrong over there—and Iran is trying to undermine us by, under the covers, doing everything that they can to stop us from getting energy and to put us in a trick bag—if the Suez Canal is bottled up, if the Strait of Hormuz is closed or the Persian Gulf is closed, we are going to lose or have substantially delayed as much as 30 percent of our energy. You can imagine what that would do to this place.

The prohibition against drilling in the Gulf of Mexico takes away about 11 percent of our energy, and the President won't allow us to have permits in that area.

Now, he says that he is concerned about it because of the environmental damage that was done by the oil spill down there when the derrick blew up. What isn't said is that the tankers that come from the Middle East and from South America spill more oil, spill more oil than that environmental tragedy that took place in the gulf spill. People don't realize that.

Now, we can drill in an environmentally safe way and we can do it in a number of places in this country and move rapidly toward energy independence. We can drill up in Alaska in the ANWR, and people in the environmental community say: Well, we're worried about the bears up there and the small animals and so forth.

I've been up there. Does anybody have any idea how big Alaska is? It is three-and-a-half times the size of Texas, and there's only 500,000 to 600,000 people who live in Alaska, and all the rest of that is wilderness except where we are drilling. If we drill in the ANWR, we could produce a great amount of oil and energy that would make us less dependent on Saudi Arabia, the Middle East, and on the communist dictator in Venezuela, Mr. President Chavez.

So we are not doing what we should do to make sure that we provide energy for this country and make sure that the cost of energy is low so people can afford it, so employers can afford to hire more people and produce more goods that could be sold here and around the world.

□ 1650

The President, for whatever reason, is blocking this, and I just can't understand why; but I think the American

people need to know that and that they need to be talking to the President, to the administration and to other Congressmen and Senators about this because, if everything goes south over in the Middle East or if the President of Venezuela decides to cut us off, we're going to see oil prices go up, up, up and the cost of gasoline go to $3, $4, $5, $6 a gallon. It's already over $3.50. If it gets to $6 a gallon, it's going to have a devastating impact on this economy. In fact, it already is having a devastating impact.

If you talk to 18-wheeler truckers, the people who haul goods and services all across this country, they'll tell you that they can't afford to keep their prices low for trucking our goods and services if the price of diesel fuel goes above $4 by very much a gallon. Yet it is above $4 a gallon right now, and it's trending higher.

If we have a problem in the Middle East or in the Gulf or in South America, wherever we get oil, it's going to have a tremendous impact, not only on our ability to buy gasoline at the pump or to provide oil for heating and for our electrical companies to provide electricity to keep our lights on, but it's going to cost us more when we go to Walmart, when we go to the grocery store, wherever we go to buy goods, food and services, because the truckers who truck those goods across the country are going to have to pay more for their fuel, and they'll pass that along to the consumer in higher prices. So this has a devastating impact on our economy because we depend too much on foreign oil.

Another thing I think everybody in this country ought to know, Mr. Speaker, is that we have the largest reserves of coal in the world, which could be converted into oil if we were to use coal-to-liquid technology. We could get as many as 5 million barrels of oil a day in the not-too-distant future, and the amount of oil we could get out of coal/shale is up to 8 trillion barrels of oil. In North and South Dakota, they just found one of the biggest oil reserves in the whole world that we could use to bring down the price of energy in this country, but we can't drill there because the President and the administration and the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Energy are blocking that.

Now, I know a lot of people around the country say, well, we've got to be concerned about the environment—and we do have to be—and we ought to be transitioning into these other technologies, but that's going to take 10, 15, 20 years. To get a nuclear plant up takes forever because you have to go through all the permits and all the governmental regulations. Sure, we could get there, but it's going to take time. In that interim period, we're dependent on fossil fuels, and we're getting those from the Middle East, from South America and from the Gulf of Mexico when we can drill there.

So it's extremely important, Mr. Speaker, that we pay attention to this and send a very strong signal to the administration that it's time for us to get on with drilling here in the United States in order to become energy independent.

I want to talk about one more thing, Mr. Speaker, which I think is extremely important. It deals with our southern border, between us and Mexico. The President of Mexico told President Obama that he did not want any government agents from the United States—the FBI or our DEA—to be able to carry weapons when they're in Mexico.

We just had one of our agents shot to death in Mexico about 2 weeks ago. It was one of our special drug agents that we had in Mexico. These agents have no ability to defend themselves. One of them was killed, and the other was severely wounded. Along the Texas American border, we've had all kinds of problems. We had a Border Patrol agent just shot recently and killed. We have farmers all over the place and ranchers down there who are scared to death to go out of their houses because these people are coming across the border—drug dealers and people who are bringing illegal aliens in.

Some of the farmers are even selling their ranches. We have one fellow down there who has had a 6,000-acre ranch in his family for over 100 years, but he sold his farm. Joe Aguilar sold his ranch because he said he's had enough. They're going across his ranch every day. We have another rancher down there who found a cache of narcotics on his land. He turned it over to the Drug Enforcement Agency. Days later, thugs came into his house and beat him and his wife half to death. The thugs said, If you do this again, we'll kill you.

Now, how would you like to live in that kind of an environment? Well, you say, That's right on the border. That can't happen here. It's 80 miles north of the Mexican-American border. It's 80 miles into the United States right now. We have signs posted, saying it's not safe for you as an American citizen to go south of here between that 80-mile marker and Mexico. Can you imagine that? Americans are afraid to even walk on American soil because of drug dealers, thugs, illegal aliens, and people who are transporting them into the country who might kill them.

We had one Border Patrol agent who was shot and killed about a week ago. When he was shot and killed, we found out that he had told these drug dealers or illegal aliens or people who were bringing illegals in to stop. Since they wouldn't stop, our Border Patrol agents were told they had to use beanbags. Get this. They had to use beanbags to fire at these people who were across the border illegally who may have been drug dealers or whatever. The fellows they were pursuing turned around with AK–47s—automatic weapons with high-velocity bullets—and shot and killed this one Border Patrol agent. The President of the United States told them the first thing they should use if they suspect people of bringing illegal drugs in and they can't get them to stop are these beanbags.

I can't imagine anything like that. These people are risking their lives day in and day out. Some are being killed, and some are being taunted day in and day out. They can't even defend themselves down there. President Obama, along with the President of Mexico, agreed that our DEA agents, when they go across the border into Mexico, can't even carry weapons.

How many people do you think who are trying to enforce our drug laws and who are sent down into foreign countries to defend this country against drug dealers and drug cartels are going to want to go down into those areas when they can't even protect themselves? Would you want to do it? I wouldn't want to do it. I'd want to have a weapon so I could at least try to survive in the event they tried to kill me.

Unfortunately, the President of the United States just said in the last few days that he will not allow any of our agents—FBI, CIA, DEA or any of them—to carry weapons when they go into Mexico because the President of Mexico, Mr. Calderon, said that he doesn't think we should.

Well, we're in a war down there on that border. If you talk to the people in Texas, they'll tell you there is a war between us and the drug dealers and the thugs who are coming across that line into our country; and there is a high suspicion that we're seeing al Qaeda- and Taliban-type terrorists coming across the border into the United States as well.

There was an article that was written just recently. I'd like to read part of it, Mr. Speaker.

It reads: ''In Texas, nearly 8,200 farms and ranches back up to the Mexican border. The men and women who live and work on those properties say they're under attack from the same drug cartels blamed for thousands of murders in Mexico. 'It's a war, make no mistake about it,' Texas Agriculture Commissioner Todd Staples said, 'and it's happening on American soil,' in this country.

''Texas farmers and ranchers produce more cotton and more cattle than any other State, so Staples is concerned this war could eventually impact our food supply, and calls it a threat to our national security.

''To raise awareness, Commissioner Staples launched the Web site ProtectYourTexasBorder.com. It's a place where frustrated and scared farmers can share their stories.

''One Texas farmer, who asked not to be identified, said it's common for him to see undocumented immigrants'' and drug dealers ''walking through his property. 'I see something and I just drive away,' he said. 'It's a problem. I've learned to live with it, and pretty much I've become numb to it.' ''

Isn't that a sad commentary on this country? We can't even defend Americans in Texas and Arizona.

Another farmer, Joe Aguilar, who I talked about earlier, said, ''You either have to beat 'em or join 'em, and I decided not to do either,'' so he sold his farm of 6,000 acres that his family had had for 100 years.

Our farmers and ranchers can't afford their own security detail, Staples said. We're going to become more dependent on food and commodities from other countries if we don't do something about it.

The President sent 14,000 National Guard people or 17,000 National Guard people down to the Gulf of Mexico when that oil spill took place off that derrick, but we've only sent 1,400 National Guard troops down to the Texas American border, which is 1,980 miles long.

We are never going to solve that border problem unless we really realize that it is an area that we have to focus on, that it's a war, that our citizens are in danger down there, and that we can't any longer allow drug dealers to have sites in the United States where they have binoculars and weapons so they can watch for the Border Patrol agents and so they can tell their counterparts to bring drugs across the border or to bring terrorists across the border because they know that the coast is clear.

□ 1700

This is something that we can't tolerate. We need to protect our border agents. They ought to have guns that they can use to stop these people. They shouldn't be shooting beanbags at them. And we certainly shouldn't be asking our CIA, DIA, DEA agents to go into Mexico to fight the drug dealers and find out what's going on and tell them they can't even have a weapon to protect themselves. This is insane.

The other thing I talked about earlier was the oil situation. It's insane for us to become more dependent on foreign energy at a time when our economy is floundering, we've still got unemployment at around 9 percent, business people can't make plans because they don't know what their energy costs are, and the people who go to work are paying $3.50 to $4 for a gallon of gas.

We can do better, and the President ought to do better. And I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the message will get to the White House loud and clear before it's just too late and our economy is hurt further.

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

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is again a privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives. And it's a privilege to sit here in this Chamber and listen to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) talk about these critical issues for the United States of America.

Each of us that come down here on so many days come here for the purpose of bringing up these critical issues and informing you, Mr. Speaker. And while that's going on, there are people all across America that are listening in and deciding for themselves the priorities and deciding for themselves what kind of job we're doing here in Congress.

I'd love to step in on the immigration debate and burn up about 30 minutes talking about that, but Mr. Speaker, I need to have this discussion with you about ObamaCare. There are a fair number of different strategies that are working here in the House of Representatives—and perhaps a number of different strategies, to some degree, going on in the United States Senate—but the circumstances are this:

Almost 1 year ago, ObamaCare passed the United States Congress and was messaged to the President, where he eagerly signed the bill. It was a combination of legislative shenanigans that took place. The bill itself that came to the floor was not a product of committee; it was a bill that was written by Speaker PELOSI's staff and her office with who knows what input and it was dropped on us in a fashion that didn't allow us an opportunity to evaluate it there, then, or on the spot. It was a combination of two bills. One of them was ObamaCare as it went out of the House over to the Senate. The Senate then promised, on the condition that ObamaCare be passed—and the votes that were necessary to pass the basis of ObamaCare were generated because the Senate decided that they would, under a reconciliation plan, avoid the filibuster rules of 60 votes in the Senate. They sent us a reconciliation plan that altered and amended ObamaCare itself. And in that package was a promise from the President of the United States that he would issue an Executive order that would take care of the concerns of the pro-life Members—pro-life Democrats who wouldn't vote for ObamaCare as long as it funded abortion.

And so the audacity of the President of the United States to take the position that he could amend legislation that passed this Congress by Executive order—which is not a constitutional position, Mr. Speaker—but that audacity was swallowed by enough people that they voted ObamaCare out of the House marginally. The reconciliation package that came from the Senate squeaked out of there because of the promises that were made and came over here and was passed because of the promises that were made. And the final cap on it was the President's Executive order that was supposed to amend ObamaCare.

And what do we have in all of this mess? We have 2,500 or so pages that are so convoluted—and if anybody in this Congress, any lawyers out there that propose to be experts, anybody that's staff on Energy and Commerce, or former Speaker PELOSI, or anybody else out here, I don't think there's a single person on the planet, no matter how good their background, no matter how intelligent, no matter how well read, no matter how many research books they might have to work with, if you would shut them in an office and cut the wires and the wireless to the outside world, not a single person out of these 6-plus billion people on this planet could read ObamaCare and be able to analyze all that it does or its implications on the lives of 300-plus million Americans. It's not possible to do so. We did, I think, a very good job of analyzing what it was in broad terms.

Some of us knew going in that there was deceptive language written into ObamaCare that automatically appropriated funds that would set up the implementation of ObamaCare—even if Congress appropriated no money to it, that would put the implementation in place and churn it on in perpetuity, Mr. Speaker. Some of that information I believe came out of some of the members of the Energy and Commerce Committee that had been analyzing this bill last fall. I believe that we had some verbal discussions on it—not here on the floor necessarily, but on-the-side conversations that I had with some of the better-informed Members of this Congress, and they aren't all here any longer in this 112th Congress.

But as we came into January, I'm thinking about how we unfund ObamaCare. And it has been my argument all along, Mr. Speaker, that the strategy is this: That first, a lot of us used all of our energy to do the best we could to kill ObamaCare. In spite of all of that, in spite of the tens of thousands of people that came from every single State in the Union to come in here and surround this Capitol and tell them keep your hands off of my health care, still the former Speaker of the House marched through the crowds with her over-sized gavel in her let-them-eat-cake moment and imposed ObamaCare on America.

Shortly after the moment that that vote went up on the board I went down to the people that had—and I say surrounded this Capitol; it wasn't just a human chain around the Capitol, it was a human doughnut around the Capitol. It was six and eight people deep all the way around the United States Capitol, unbroken, human doughnut around the Capitol, still with thousands of people left over in the corner, so to speak. If you envision a circle—there isn't one, I understand, but they were standing in clusters by the thousands. Still, not part of that human doughnut, they came here and said keep your hands off of our health care.

That bill finally passed here on the floor and was messaged to the Senate. And I went down with that group, as did MICHELE BACHMANN and several

others—Pete Hoekstra of Michigan comes to mind as another individual that was back and forth communicating with the people that came here to peacefully petition the government for redress of grievances, exactly in line with the First Amendment to the Constitution. And I promised them, as did MICHELE BACHMANN, that I would introduce legislation to repeal ObamaCare. That happened the very next day, and it happened for us within 3 minutes of each other.

So I laid out, though, the strategy over the next few days and weeks to repeal ObamaCare. And I'm going to refresh this now, Mr. Speaker, for the minds of those who are paying attention, and it's this: First, all energy was focused on killing ObamaCare. I didn't burn up 1 minute of media time that I can think of talking about what to do if it passed. I remember people asking me out here in the crowd, what will you do if it passes? And my answer was, ''I'm focused on killing it. We'll worry about that, that's another subject for another time, I'm focused on killing it.'' Well, it did pass. And we turned the focus, then, on repealing it. And the beginning of that was that opening of business—actually same day because this passed after midnight on a Sunday night, so it was Monday morning. This Congress opened for business at 9 o'clock. At that minute, there were two requests waiting in place to bring the legislation to repeal ObamaCare.

□ 1710

Then I began to lay out this strategy which was, get as many cosponsors on the repeal as possible. And as that number grew, sometime in June, or towards the summer, I introduced a discharge petition. That discharge petition was designed to gain 218 signatures. With that, the Speaker of the House and no one can block it. It must come to the floor, no amendments, for an up-or-down vote. Well, we got to 178 signatures on the discharge petition, which is pretty good. I believe that number was 178. I question that, because there were six Republicans that did not sign it, but all but six signed it. We had one Democrat that signed it. So I guess that takes it down there to maybe 173, looks more like the number. I would just correct that for the record, Mr. Speaker. Let that be 173 signatures on the discharge petition. We were working for 218, is the point. Yet the discharge petition that, if it had been brought to the floor, would have been voted on and could have passed, and if it had been forced to the floor under a discharge petition, it would have passed and we would have repealed ObamaCare from the House then.

But it always was a way to get people on record so we knew who was for repeal of ObamaCare and who was unwilling to go on record for repeal of ObamaCare. And it always was something that candidates for Congress could look at that and challenge the individual that they were running against: ''Why didn't you sign the discharge petition. Are you really against ObamaCare? Your name's not on there.''

It was useful for a good number of candidates, and some of them have said they wouldn't be here in this Congress today if they didn't have the discharge petition to measure their opponent with. So it always had a utility in two ways: seeking to repeal ObamaCare, and putting a marker down so that the American public could discern, who's for ObamaCare and who's against it and who's afraid to take a position.

All that was taking place last summer, all the way on up through August, September, October and into the election on the 2nd day of November, where, through the summer, continuing the strategy. It was not just the discharge petition. It was use it and other things, and win the majority here in the House. When we have the majority in the House, then we can bring the repeal of ObamaCare.

And I said for a long time: Repeal of ObamaCare needs to be H.R. 1. That's the highest priority for the Speaker of the House. The Speaker traditionally gets the first 10 bills to name, H.R. 1 through H.R. 10. You can look at the priority by their number. So number 1, I believe, needed to be the repeal of ObamaCare as the highest priority, Mr. Speaker.

Well, it turned out that H.R. 2 was the repeal of ObamaCare. All right. There's no complaint on my part. That's a very high priority, in any case, and we did pass the repeal of ObamaCare, consistent with the strategy that I laid out way last summer.

And then, way last summer, I was making the case that no money can be spent by the Federal Government unless the House of Representatives agrees to it. We can shut off all funding to ObamaCare here in the House of Representatives, and if the Senate disagrees and the House says no, then no money gets spent by the Federal Government, until we reach an agreement. That's what's going on right now, Mr. Speaker.

So, I argued then and I argue now that part of this strategy to undo ObamaCare has to be to unfund ObamaCare. To defund ObamaCare, to phrase it a little bit differently. It was always part of the strategy going back almost a year. And as we move forward to defund ObamaCare, we need to understand that there were automatic appropriations that were written into ObamaCare, and that's part of the dialogue that was going on last fall in a very quiet little way but no one had drilled into it that I know of and looked at all of the pieces, on our side. On the other side, they wrote it in.

So I'd like to hear from someone who was involved in that on the Democrat side, I'd like to hear from former Speaker PELOSI, or maybe I'd like to hear from the whip, STENY HOYER: Did they know it was in there? Of course they did. Did they direct their staff to write it in there? Probably. Who on that staff devised this strategy to put in all of these threads that add up to $105.5 billion? I would like to know the answer to that question. That will emerge over time, as history has a way of uncovering these things.

But, in any case, the automatic funding was there. Another way to phrase it would be self-enacting funding was there. And I drafted language to cut off the funding to ObamaCare patterned off of the funding that was shut off to put an end to the Vietnam War. That's in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in the media record some time back. But about 5 or so years ago, I got curious as to how I remembered the Vietnam War being ended versus what actually happened. I went back and read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the debate on that, Mr. Speaker. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reveals this: There were about three different places and perhaps more, but we uncovered three different places in appropriations bills where Congress shut off the funding to carry out the war in Vietnam. It began in 1973. The most significant was on a continuing resolution in the spring of 1974. As I read through that language, maybe 5 years ago, it gave me an inspiration on how to bring language to shut off the funding to ObamaCare.

I'm going to go from memory here. It's in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. So it won't be precisely accurate but it thematically will be right. The language that was written into a continuing resolution in the spring of 1974 that shut off the American support in the war in Vietnam reads close to this: Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds in this act and no funds in any act heretofore appropriated shall be used for offensive or defensive operations in the land of Vietnam, in the skies over it, the seas adjacent to it or in the adjacent countries, and it names at least Laos and Cambodia along the side. I believe they also said Thailand. But it named the countries next to it and it said, no funds shall be used for offensive or defensive operations, Vietnam, the skies over it, the seas adjacent to it or the countries adjacent to it, and no funds in any act heretofore appropriated shall be used for such purpose.

In other words, whatever money was in the pipeline got shut off. They shut off all involvement. And you can imagine, and I don't know it to be factually true, Mr. Speaker, that there were bullets and grenades and munitions that were being unloaded on the dock at Da Nang that were loaded back up again on the ship and hauled away. I don't know that to be fact, but figuratively that's what happened. They shut off everything. With language written into a continuing resolution, they shut off a war here in the United States Congress.

Now if we can shut off a war here in the United States Congress and stop all the money that's in the pipeline and

any money that might be coming at the same time and all the funds that are in the act, none of them can be used to conduct the operations in Vietnam, we can sure as the world in a continuing resolution write legislation that will shut off all of this automatic funding that was written into ObamaCare. How could anyone imagine that somehow because the Congressional Research Services defined the spending that is automatic spending here in the ObamaCare act, they called it mandated appropriations and fund transfers. Mandated appropriations and fund transfers have been defined by some folks as mandatory spending. And then they go on to argue that mandatory spending cannot be addressed in an appropriations bill. I would remind them, this is the United States Congress, and the former majority in this Congress wrote all this into a bill. And it's automatic funding. It's self-enacting funding. It's not completely unprecedented as a tactic, but it is completely unprecedented in its magnitude. Therefore, this Congress can't be hiding behind a rule or defining a piece of legislation as mandatory spending. We're not mandated by any previous Congress. No Congress can bind a subsequent Congress. If this House of Representatives says no, then ''no'' means ''no.'' We sometimes have to remind the Senate over and over again, and we would have to do that under the proposal that I'm making.

But I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that this is an unconstitutional bill. It's been pushed through this Congress in an unprecedented fashion, with a series of shenanigans that this country has never seen before. Two Federal courts have found it unconstitutional, Judge Vincent found it completely unconstitutional, and it's on its way through the circuit and to the Supreme Court and it should be expedited directly to the Supreme Court, except the White House is holding the ball. The White House is holding the ball because their tactic is to try to get ObamaCare implemented to the maximum amount before such time, so that it becomes too late to pull it out by the roots. That's part of the tactic.

So from the litigation standpoint, the unconstitutional components are the unconstitutional mandates, compelling States in violation of the 10th Amendment that they have to comply with an act to provide these services, and compelling individuals that they have to buy insurance even though they're not participating in the system whatsoever.

□ 1720

That's never been done before. It's completely unprecedented, Mr. Speaker. So we see the Obama administration now offering a little carrot out there to the States, to the Governors, saying we will waive the mandate for the States. Now, the caveat is you have to provide an equal or better policy yourself in order to be able to qualify for the waiver, and you've got until 2014 to do that.

But that act, which likely won't come to any kind of fruition, is a means, I believe, to take away the argument that it's an unconstitutional mandate on the States. The White House has also had language that came out a couple of weeks ago that they would consider or entertain the alteration or perhaps the elimination of the individual mandate.

Now, that's the second component that might come out of the White House that would, if those two provisions were altered in practice, they can go before the Supreme Court and argue that it's not a constitutional violation because it's not really a mandate. And that's how they hope to walk through this thicket of constitutional prohibitions and hopefully they can find a decision at the Supreme Court level that will allow them to impose ObamaCare on the rest of America. That's their litigation tactic, Mr. Speaker.

Their legislation tactic is this: The pressure that grows, they're trying to take the pressure off. So when the House played into their hands a week or so ago by bringing legislation on the 1099 component of this, this outrageous requirement that people report to the IRS any cumulative transactions with any entity that meet or exceed $600 in a year, which means if you pay somebody to mow your lawn you have to turn in a squeal form to the IRS. And this is something that was put into ObamaCare, these extra requirements, because they were able to score it as, my memory is that it was then $17 billion it was supposed to generate in taxes because the IRS was going to go in and audit these squeal forms, the 1099 forms.

Well, in any case, that was the most objectionable component in the short term that came with ObamaCare. Therefore, this House picked this up and sent it to the Senate. And what happens? The Democrats in the Senate are going to take it and send it to the President. Why? Because they think that people shouldn't be required to file the 1099 forms and they can find another place to come up with $17 billion? No, Mr. Speaker, that's not it. It's this: They understand that the objections to the 1099 squeal forms that were written into ObamaCare are the most egregious of all in the short term, and they want to take the lid off the pressure cooker, let some steam out, put the lid back on, and they want to continue to frantically implement ObamaCare with the $105.5 billion that is written into it and the self-enacting automatic spending that is there.

So as the pressure builds against ObamaCare, they're willing to take a little piece off here, lift the lid off the pressure cooker there, and drain that heat down so that they can hang on to the major components of ObamaCare and get it implemented. And while we have a whole series of different initiatives that are going on around here driven now by the new Republican majority, five different proposals within Energy and Commerce to change the language from mandatory spending to, I suppose, optional spending or something, all of those are authorization pieces of language. There is no leverage to get them passed. If Energy and Commerce passes that legislation, it goes over to HARRY REID's desk where it probably goes directly into the trash, not into the desk drawer.

So we can't produce leverage to change the definition. We have to look at the leverage that we have, the leverage that we're gifted with. And it's this: This government comes to, runs out of money at midnight, March 18. We are all staring at that deadline. And the House of Representatives has demonstrated clearly that we want to avoid having the President or HARRY REID shut this government down. We want to keep this government functioning in a responsible fashion.

But I will say, Mr. Speaker, that functioning in a responsible fashion is not turning a blind eye to $105.5 billion. It is not wondering where this number came from. This number is in this CRS report. This is a Congressional Research Services report titled, ''Appropriations and Fund Transfers in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.'' It's written by C. Stephen Redhead, specialist in health policy, and it's dated February 10, 2011.

In this, now that the numbers are in here, when you go through and highlight the numbers, we put it into a spreadsheet. This spreadsheet, Mr. Speaker, this spreadsheet shows the total of all these automatic appropriations. They come to $105.464 billion, and that's over a decade period of time. This is the minimum. This is the threshold number. It's not the maximum amount that can be spent.

Just to give an example, here is one of the items in here of automatic appropriations, self-enacting appropriations that shows this. Let's see, it totals $10 billion through FY19. But this is for Medicare innovation. Medicare innovation. This is funds that goes to Congressional Medicare or Medicaid Services, CMS, FY11 it's $1 billion. And it's written in such a way that it's $1 billion every year, and here's the language, in perpetuity, Mr. Speaker.

This is one example of Medicare innovation that gets appropriated automatically, written and hidden into the bill, a billion dollars every year for Medicare innovation that goes on in perpetuity. And it doesn't require an act of Congress. It's not an act of an Appropriations Committee in the 112th Congress that funds the FY12 or 11 or any subsequent year. This is the perpetual motion machine that keeps spitting out money. It will spit out money forever. It will spit out money until Congress conducts an affirmative act to shut off this funding.

That's what I sought to do with the amendment that I offered in H.R. 1, which said, patterned off of the Vietnam War amendment, it said—and I'm

going to do this in summary, too—notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds in this act, and no funds in any act previously enacted, shall be used to carry out the provisions of, in summary, ObamaCare. That language pulls out by the roots everything that's here in this CRS report and shuts off the automatic appropriations.

There is an issue, also written into ObamaCare, another sleight of hand that took place. There are many others, but this one is particularly egregious that grants the authority to the Secretary of Health and Human Services to do transfers to fund the implementation of ObamaCare essentially at her discretion, and probably out of the U.S. Treasury, just to do the automatic appropriations; to grant that kind of authority to a bureaucrat, to circumvent Congress, to set up that authority, a transfer authority, which is the equivalent of an appropriations authority that goes on in perpetuity to the Secretary of Health and Human Services. While there are automatic appropriations to the tune of $105.5 billion for a decade that also go on in perpetuity without—so binding the future Congress in a way that requires an affirmative action on this Congress's part to shut it off.

So, Mr. Speaker, where I am is this: I am done dancing around with all of this. I've looked at it. I've analyzed it. I've joined with some of my colleagues. I thank my colleague MICHELE BACHMANN for raising this up in the media and doing as much media as she has done over this last week or so. I drove this with all that I had back when we were working on and building up to and passing H.R. 1. I will continue to do so.

We must shut off this funding. We must do it affirmatively. We need to do it where we have leverage. There are only two places where there is leverage: that is in the continuing resolution in one place, and the other one is the debt ceiling. But what I have said is I will vote for no appropriations bill that funds Planned Parenthood. I will vote for no appropriations bill that should be shutting off the funding, the automatic funding especially to ObamaCare. That's where I stand. That's where I will stand.

If enough Members of this Congress stand with me, we will put an end to ObamaCare. And we need do so early. We've got a lot of good work to do in this Congress. We can either look forward to a long, protracted battle, a war of attrition over this that goes on over the entire 112th Congress and on through the elections of 2012, including the Presidential election of 2012, or we can pull this tumor out by the roots, this malignant tumor called ObamaCare that is metastasizing as we speak while this automatic funding is being poured in and likely being transferred. We can put the brakes on it.

□ 1730

We can pull it out by the roots, every bit of it, get rid of it lock, stock, and barrel. That's what we must do. It's our obligation, our pledge, and this House has voted to repeal it. This House has voted to unfund it, and every Republican in the House and every Republican in the Senate has voted to repeal ObamaCare. Two Federal courts have found it unconstitutional. It is irresponsible to tolerate the funding to ObamaCare while it goes on on our watch, while we have the power to shut it off, and while we understand that it is unconstitutional into the bargain.

So, Mr. Speaker, I came to this floor tonight to urge this House to stand together, to write the language into the CR that I asked be written into H.R. 1 so we can go forward and join with the American people, the supermajority of the American people that have rejected ObamaCare, that want their liberty back, that want constitutional legislation coming out of this place. The very reason that there are 87 new freshman Republicans in this House of Representatives: Every one of them ran on repeal of ObamaCare. Every one of them voted to repeal it. They brought a new mandate here. Many of us have been standing here fighting it.

I welcome them, God's gift to America, and I ask all, Mr. Speaker, to join with me. Let's shut off all of this funding to ObamaCare; that that is in the existing appropriations and that that is automatically appropriated, whether some might want to call it mandatory spending—I call it self-enacting automatic appropriations—written in a deceptive fashion, must be shut off, and I will continue to work on this cause with every effort that I have, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate your attention and your indulgence.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HURT (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending the memorial service of a fallen soldier.

Mr. REICHERT (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of the passing of his mother-in-law.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 10, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the third quarter of 2007; third and fourth quarters of 2008; first, second, third and fourth quarters of 2009; and first, second, third, and fourth quarters of 2010 pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒											
Committee total					$0.00		$0.00		$0.00		$0.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. FRANK D. LUCAS, Chairman, Feb. 1, 2011.

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Barbara Lee	10/5	10/7	Brazil		1,085.44						1,085.44

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2010—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
							[3] 5,573.20				5,573.20
Pearl Alice Marsh,	10/5	10/7	Brazil		1,020.44						1,020.44
							[3] 1,619.70				1,619.70
Committee total					2,105.88		7,192.90				9,298.78

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Round-trip airfare.

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN, Feb. 17, 2011.

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Eni F.H. Faleomavaega	8/5	8/7	Vanuatu		1,405.00						1,405.00
	8/7	8/8	Samoa		632.00						632.00
							[3] 8,540.17				8,540.17
	8/13	8/14	Samoa		538.00						538.00
	8/15	8/20	Fiji		1,742.00						1,742.00
							[3] 984.00				984.00
Committee total					4,371.00		9,524.17				13,841.17

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Round-trip airfare.

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN, Feb. 17, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2007

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Steve Chabot	7/19	7/23	Serbia		914.00						914.00
			Bosnia								
			Croatia								
Hon. Nydia Velázquez	8/18	8/20	Tunisia		482.00						482.00
	8/20	8/22	Turkey		1,242.00						1,242.00
	8/22	8/24	Croatia		1,064.00						1,064.00
	8/24	8/27	Germany		1,629.00						1,629.00
Committee total					5,331.00						5,331.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ, Feb. 28, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2008

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Nydia Velázquez	8/18	8/18	Morocco		284.00						284.00
	8/19	8/21	Kenya		714.00						714.00
	8/21	8/22	The Netherlands		455.00						455.00
Hon. Steve King	8/25	8/26	Germany		216.00						216.00
Hon. Steve Chabot	8/27	8/30	Chad		786.00						786.00
Committee total					2,455.00						2,455.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ, Feb. 28, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2008

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Nydia Velázquez	11/06	11/09	Peru		1,384.12						1,384.12
	11/09	11/11	Chile		635.56						635.56
	11/11	11/13	Paraguay		372.37						327.37
Committee total					2,392.05						2,392.05

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ, Feb. 28, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ, Feb. 28, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Nydia Velázquez	4/04	4/06	Bahrain		892.00						892.00
	4/06	4/08	United Arab Emirates		1,418.00						1,418.00
	4/08	4/10	Italy		1,122.00						1,122.00
	4/10	4/13	Italy		1,842.00						1,842.00
Committee total					5,274.00						5,274.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ, Feb. 28, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ, Feb. 28, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Steve King	12/4	12/5	Kuwait		159.00						159.00
	12/5	12/6	Afghanistan		78.00						78.00
Committee total					237.00						237.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ, Feb. 28, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ, Feb. 28, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ, Feb. 28, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ, Feb. 28, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ, Feb. 28, 2011.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

782. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, Army Case Number 08-08, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

783. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, Army Case Number 08-04, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

784. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Department's report on the amount of purchases from foreign entities for fiscal year 2010 should be sumitted by April 2011; to the Committee on Armed Services.

785. A letter from the Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a report including matters relating to the interdiction of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2291-4 Public Law 107-108; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

786. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer/President, Financing Corporation, transmitting a copy of the Financing Corporation's Statement on the System of Internal Controls and the 2010 Audited Financial Statements; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

787. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Management and Administration and Designated Reporting Official, Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

788. A letter from the Director, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's 2010 report on Apportionment of Membership on the Regional Fishery Management Councils, pursuant to Section 302(b)(2)(B) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

789. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting follow-up information concerning those pending cases where Section 3 of the Defense of Marriage Act has been challenged; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

790. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's Thirty-third annual Report to Congress pursuant to section 201 of the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 18a(j); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

791. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Quarterly Listings; Safety Zones, Security Zones, Special Local Regulations, Drawbridge Operation Regulations and Regulated Navigation Areas [USCG-2010-0399] received February 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

792. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300, A300-600, A310, A318, A319, A320, A321, A330-300, A340-200, A340-300, A340-500, A340-600, and A380-800 Series Airplanes; and Model A330-201, A330-202, A330-203, A330-223, A330-243 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1279; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-258-AD; Amendment 39-16573; AD 2010-02-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

793. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; B/E Aerospace Protective Breathing Equipment (PBE) Part Number 119003-11 Installed on Various Transport Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0797; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-141-AD; Amendment 39-16562; AD 2011-01-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

794. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing company Model 757-200, -200CB, and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1208; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-270-AD; Amendment 39-16527; AD 2011-01-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

795. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30764; Amdt. No. 3409] received February 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

796. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30763; Amdt. No. 3408] received February 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

797. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Fort Worth NAS JRB (Carswell Field), TX [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0183; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASW-5] received February 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

798. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Kwajalein Island, Marshall Islands, RMI [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0808; Airspace Docket No. 10-AWP-14] received February 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

799. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30760; Amdt. No. 491] received February 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

800. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Crew Resource Management Training for Crewmembers in Part 135 Operations [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0023; Amendment No.: 135-122] (RIN: 2120-AJ32) received February 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

801. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting annual report pursuant to the MINER Act of 2006; jointly to the Committees on Education and the Workforce and Energy and Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. CHANDLER):

H.R. 964. A bill to protect consumers from price-gouging of gasoline and other fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 965. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to preserve the effectiveness of medically important antibiotics used in the treatment of human and animal diseases; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 966. A bill to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SCHMIDT:

H.R. 967. A bill to amend the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to support efforts to control and eradicate bed bugs with respect to public health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCKEON (for himself, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. AKIN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WEST, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. KLINE, Mr. HECK, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. BROOKS):

H.R. 968. A bill to provide for certain processes and limitations relating to the detention of certain individuals by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. FLEMING):

H.R. 969. A bill to prohibit conditioning licensure of a health care provider upon participation in a health plan; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HALL (for himself and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 970. A bill to reauthorize the civil aviation research and development projects and activities of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 971. A bill to improve the understanding and coordination of critical care health services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. KLINE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. FOXX, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GOWDY, Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. HECK, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. KELLY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. MULVANEY):

H.R. 972. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to ensure the right of employees to a secret ballot election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. ADAMS (for herself, Mr. POSEY, Mr. AKIN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CARTER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ISSA, Mr. PENCE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MARINO, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. COLE, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. PAUL, Mr. REED, Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. BUERKLE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 973. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prevent the misuse of foreign law in Federal courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 974. A bill to direct the President to submit to Congress a report on the long-term costs of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and Operation Enduring Freedom in Iraq and Afghanistan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 975. A bill to amend the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to include bullying and harassment prevention programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 976. A bill to terminate certain hydropower reservations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan (for himself and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 977. A bill to designate as wilderness certain land and inland water within the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 978. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to preclude use of the social security account number on Government-issued identification cards issued in connection with Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP benefits and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 979. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to ensure program integrity, transparency, and cost savings in the pricing and contracting of prescription drug benefits under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 980. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to make local funds of the District of Columbia for a fiscal year available for use by the District at the beginning of the fiscal year at the rate of operations provided under the local budget act for the fiscal year if the regular District of Columbia appropriation bill for a fiscal year does not become law prior to the beginning of such fiscal year; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 981. A bill to allow Members of Congress to decline certain retirement benefits and contributions by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 982. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a refundable credit against income tax to assist individuals with high residential energy costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 983. A bill to ensure that American materials are used for Smithsonian construction activities and are sold in Smithsonian gift shops, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself, Mr. BOREN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BENISHEK):

H.R. 984. A bill to amend title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for a process for waiver of requirements of that title where the requirement is asserted to otherwise result in a significant decrease in access to coverage or significant increase in premiums or other costs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 985. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the Armed Forces to display the flags of the District of Columbia, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands whenever the official flags of all 50 States are displayed; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COSTA, Ms. CHU, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 986. A bill to provide for American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas to be treated as States for certain criminal justice programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 987. A bill to amend section 5542 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that any hours worked by Federal firefighters under a qualified trade-of-time arrangement shall be excluded for purposes of determinations relating to overtime pay; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 988. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants for States to implement minimum and enhanced DNA collection processes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 989. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require, at the option of a State, drug manufacturers to pay rebates to State prescription drug discount programs as a condition of participation in a rebate agreement for outpatient prescription drugs under the Medicaid program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 990. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to allow the importation of polar bear trophies taken in sport hunts in Canada; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 991. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to allow importation of polar bear trophies taken in sport hunts in Canada before the date the polar bear was determined to be a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. STARK, Mr. PAUL, Mr. FILNER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HONDA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. CONYERS):

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JONES, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia):

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that State and local governments should be supported for taking actions to discourage illegal immigration and that legislation should be enacted to ease the burden on State and local governments for taking such actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HENSARLING:

H. Res. 155. A resolution electing a Member to a Standing Committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KUCINICH:

H. Res. 156. A resolution calling for an environmental and social responsibility amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H. Res. 157. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a Global Marshall Plan holds the potential to demonstrate the commitment of the United States to peace and prosperity through poverty reduction in the United States and abroad; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H. Res. 158. A resolution expressing support for the goals and ideals of National Patient Safety Awareness Week; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Res. 159. A resolution condemning al Shabaab for its practice of child conscription in the Horn of Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 965.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 966.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this legislation is based is found in Article I, Section 8, Clause 9; Article III, Section 1, Clause 1; and Article III, Section 2, Clause 2, of the Constitution, which grant Congress authority over federal courts.

By Mrs. SCHMIDT:

H.R. 967.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McKEON:

H.R. 968.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to ''provide for the common defense,'' ''make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water,'' ''raise and support armies,'' and ''provide and maintain a navy,'' as enumerated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 969.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Current law has created an unconstitutional regulatory structure over the health care system. In order to make this system more compatible with a proper Constitutional structure, this bill will ensure that there is less regulation impeding the doctor-patient relationship.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 970.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Ms. BALDWIN:

H.R. 971.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 972.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. ADAMS:

H.R. 973.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article III, Section 2—The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority . . .

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 974.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 975.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Civil Rights Enforcement: Fourteenth Amendment, Sections 1 and 5—Section 1: All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. . . . Section 5: The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

Spending Authorization: Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 976.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

Specifically regarding Public Lands: Federal and State Powers Thereover, ''The comprehensive authority of Congress over public lands includes the power to prescribe the times, conditions, and mode of transfer thereof and to designate the persons to whom the transfer shall be made, to declare the dignity and effect of titles emanating from the United States . . . (Gibson v. Chouteau, 80 U.S. (13 Wall.) 92, 99 (1872))''

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 977.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 978.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 979.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 980.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 17 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 981.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 6 of Article I of the Constitution as amended by the 27th Amendment to the Constitution. This section of the Constitution allows Congress to set their own compensation so long as new representatives have been elected.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 982.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 983.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan:

H.R. 984.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 985.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (Clause 14), which grants Congress the power to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 986.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 987.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 988.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Katie Sepich Enhanced DNA Collection Act is constitutionally authorized under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. The Necessary and Proper Clause supports the expansion of congressional authority beyond the explicit authorities that are directly discernible from the text. Additionally, the Preamble to the Constitution provides support of the authority to enact legislation to promote the General Welfare.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 989.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 990.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 991.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 27: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 69: Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 91: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FLEMING, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. YODER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WEST, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 98: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 104: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

H.R. 114: Mr. STEARNS and Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 178: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MICA, Mr. TURNER, Mr. REYES, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 181: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 186: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 350: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 401: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 428: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 463: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. CANSECO.

H.R. 471: Mrs. SCHMIDT.

H.R. 481: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 529: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 531: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 589: Mr. WAXMAN and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 606: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 616: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 642: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. YODER, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 673: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 674: Ms. FOXX, Mr. AKIN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 679: Mrs. ELLMERS and Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 680: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 683: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 694: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 709: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 721: Mr. OLVER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 733: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 743: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 745: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. YODER, Mr. WEST, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 746: Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 749: Mr. HERGER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 750: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 763: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 819: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 825: Mr. SHUSTER and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 835: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HOLT, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 840: Mr. CANSECO and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 862: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 872: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. MARINO, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 875: Mr. HERGER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 880: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 887: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 894: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 900: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BARROW, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 910: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 920: Mr. AKIN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. YODER, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 943: Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 948: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 959: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.J. Res. 37: Mr. KLINE, Ms. FOXX, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.J. Res. 47: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. TIPTON.

H. Res. 23: Mr. CANSECO.

H. Res. 83: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 100: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. OLVER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. STARK, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DEUTCH, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Res. 135: Mr. LEVIN.

H. Res. 140: Mr. WALBERG.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 830

OFFERED BY: MR. PAULSEN

AMENDMENT NO. 4: Page 6, line 15, strike ''AND''.

Page 6, line 16, before the period insert the following: '', AND MEMBERS AND VETERANS WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES AND THEIR FAMILIES''.

Page 7, line 11, strike ''or''.

Page 7, line 17, strike the period and insert ''; or''.

Page 7, after line 17, insert the following:

(D) such members and veterans of the Armed Forces who have service-connected injuries, and survivors and dependents of such members and veterans of the Armed Forces with such injuries.

H.R. 830

OFFERED BY: MS. WATERS

AMENDMENT NO. 5: At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 4. STUDY ON IMPACTS REQUIRED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, conduct a study on the negative impacts of underwater mortgage loans on the housing market and the economy of the United States and report to the Congress on the findings of such study, including recommendations to the Congress on how to mitigate such impacts.

(b) UNDERWATER MORTGAGE DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term ''underwater mortgage'' means a mortgage loan on an owner-occupied residential property that has an appraised value that is less than the outstanding obligation under such mortgage loan.

H.R. 830

OFFERED BY: MS. WATERS

AMENDMENT NO. 6: At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 4. PUBLICATION OF MEMBER AVAILABILITY FOR ASSISTANCE.

Not later than 5 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall publish to its Website on the World Wide Web in a prominent location, large point font, and boldface type the following statement: ''The FHA Short Refinance Program, which would have provided borrowers who are current on their mortgage but owe more than their home is worth with the ability to refinance into an FHA loan with better terms, has been terminated. If you owe more on your mortgage than your home is worth, please contact your Member of Congress for assistance.''.

H.R. 830

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 7: At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 4. TREATMENT OF BONUSES FOR FINANCIAL SECTOR EMPLOYEES.

The Federal regulatory agencies for banking and financial institutions and for securities regulation shall jointly issue regulations that—

(1) require all new employees of any institution, company, or entity regulated by such a regulatory agency, upon hiring, to sign a contract stipulating that any bonus income provided to such employee will be paid in securities or obligations that such institution, company, or entity creates or deals in in its regular course of business;

(2) require that any such bonuses paid shall be held in escrow for such period as may be necessary to determine whether the such securities or obligations created or dealt with by such institution, company, or entity are of substandard quality or cannot be readily identified as an asset or a liability;

(3) require such escrow accounts to be portable so that an employee may change jobs without hindrance; and

(4) prohibit use of any such bonuses to hedge against future losses.

H.R. 830

OFFERED BY: MR. HOLT

AMENDMENT NO. 8: At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. MODIFICATION OF REAL PROPERTY STANDARD DEDUCTION.

(a) EXTENSION.—Subparagraph (C) of section 63(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''in 2008 or 2009'' and inserting ''after December 31, 2007, and before January 1, 2015''.

(b) ADJUSTMENTS FOR INFLATION.—Subparagraph (B) of section 63(c)(4) of such Code is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (i), by striking the period at the end of clause (ii) and inserting '', and'', and by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

''(iii) 'calendar year 2010' in the case of dollar amounts contained in paragraph (7)(B).''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2009.

(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

H.R. 830

OFFERED BY: MRS. MALONEY

AMENDMENT NO. 9: After section 1, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) there are 35,610 underwater mortgages in Alabama;

(2) 7,801 underwater mortgages in Alaska;

(3) 648,387 underwater mortgages in Arizona;

(4) 27,580 underwater mortgages in Arkansas;

(5) 2,172,700 mortgages in California;

(6) 221,097 underwater mortgages in Colorado;

(7) 97,244 underwater mortgages in Connecticut;

(8) 23,906 underwater mortgages in Delaware;

(9) 2,029,128 underwater mortgages in Florida;

(10) 449,971 underwater mortgages in Georgia;

(11) 24,664 underwater mortgages in Hawaii;

(12) 61,566 underwater mortgages in Idaho;

(13) 431,050 underwater mortgages in Illinois;

(14) 68,196 underwater mortgages in Indiana;

(15) 28,976 underwater mortgages in Iowa;

(16) 32,787 underwater mortgages in Kansas;

(17) 24,880 underwater mortgages in Kentucky;

(18) 298,554 underwater mortgages in Maryland;

(19) 222,599 underwater mortgages in Massachusetts;

(20) 519,716 underwater mortgages in Michigan;

(21) 90,090 underwater mortgages in Minnesota;

(22) 122,543 underwater mortgages in Missouri;

(23) 8,650 underwater mortgages in Montana;

(24) 21,388 underwater mortgages in Nebraska;

(25) 390,192 underwater mortgages in Nevada;

(26) 37,488 underwater mortgages in New Hampshire;

(27) 286,293 underwater mortgages in New Jersey;

(28) 29,375 underwater mortgages in New Mexico;

(29) 129,633 underwater mortgages in New York;

(30) 160,007 underwater mortgages in North Carolina;

(31) 3,582 underwater mortgages in North Dakota;

(32) 441,379 underwater mortgages in Ohio;

(33) 24,411 underwater mortgages in Oklahoma;

(34) 108,335 underwater mortgages in Oregon;

(35) 132,805 underwater mortgages in Pennsylvania;

(36) 45,511 underwater mortgages in Rhode Island;

(37) 85,226 underwater mortgages in South Carolina;

(38) 133,956 underwater mortgages in Tennessee;

(39) 367,954 underwater mortgages in Texas;

(40) 98,093 underwater mortgages in Utah;

(41) 276,910 underwater mortgages in Virginia;

(42) 209,577 underwater mortgages in Washington;

(43) 15,240 underwater mortgages in Washington D.C.;

(44) and 81,267 underwater mortgages in Wisconsin.

(45) the aggregate number of mortgages estimated to be underwater in such States is 10,780,236; and

(46) by voting to terminate the FHA Refinance Program under this Act without a suggested replacement, the Congress is voting to terminate a program that may have helped these underwater borrowers.

H.R. 830

OFFERED BY: MR. DEUTCH

AMENDMENT NO. 10: Page 7, line 11, strike ''or''.

Page 7, line 17, strike the period and insert ''; or''.

Page 7, after line 17, insert the following:

(D) a person who is 62 years of age or older.

H.R. 830

OFFERED BY: MR. FITZPATRICK

AMENDMENT NO. 11: Page 5, line 12, after the period insert the following: ''All such unexpended balances so rescinded and permanently canceled shall be retained in the General Fund of the Treasury for reducing the debt of the Federal Government.''.

H.R. 830

OFFERED BY: MR. INSLEE

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Page 6, line 16, before the period insert ''AND REPLACEMENT PROGRAM''.

Page 6, line 19, before ''the extent'' insert ''(A)''.

Page 6, line 20, after ''section 2'' insert '', including''.

Page 6, line 21, before the period insert the following: '', and (B) the need, and appropriate guidelines and standards for, a mortgage insurance program of the Secretary that (i) provides for loan modification involving a write-down of the remaining principal balance on existing mortgages on 1- to 4-family residences under which such principal balance exceeds the appraised value of the mortgaged residence, and (ii) serves the needs of covered homeowners with such mortgages''.

Page 7, line 1, after ''paragraph (1)'' insert the following: '', setting forth the Secretary's determination of the need for, and the appropriate guidelines and standards for, the mortgage insurance program determined pursuant to paragraph (1)(B),''.

Page 7, line 1, after ''best practices,'' insert ''including''.

Page 7, line 3, before the period insert the following: ''and to the mortgage insurance program identified and described pursuant to paragraph (1)(B)''.

Page 7, after line 17, add the following:

(4) IMPLEMENTATION.—Upon the expiration of the 90-day period beginning upon the submission to the Congress of the report required under paragraph (2), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall implement the mortgage insurance program described in such report pursuant to paragraph (1)(B) through issuance of appropriate guidelines and standards set forth in the report.

H.R. 830

OFFERED BY: MR. INSLEE

AMENDMENT NO. 13: At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 4. STUDY OF BORROWERS OTHERWISE ELIGIBLE FOR FHA REFINANCE PROGRAM.

Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall conduct a study, and submit to the Congress a report regarding the results of such study, to determine the effects that authorizing bankruptcy courts, in bankruptcy proceedings under chapter 13 of title 11, United States Code, to reduce the debt secured by a mortgage on the principal residence of a debtor would have on mortgagors who, but for termination of the FHA Refinance Program under this Act, would have qualified for refinancing of a mortgage under such Program, under the terms of such Program as in effect immediately before the enactment of this Act.

H.R. 830

OFFERED BY: MR. INSLEE

AMENDMENT NO. 14: At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF FORECLOSURE LAWS.

The Attorney General of the United States, in consultation and coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection of the Federal Reserve System, any other appropriate Federal banking regulatory agencies, and the Attorneys General of the States, shall pursue, to the fullest extent of the law, criminal prosecution of directors and officers of any financial institutions that the Attorney General, in such consultation and coordination, determines have failed to comply with State laws relating to foreclosure of mortgages on residential real property and shall provide appropriate assistance to such State Attorneys General in such prosecutions.

H.R. 830

OFFERED BY: MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT NO. 15: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. USE OF FUNDING FOR FHA REFINANCE PROGRAM.

Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, all unexpended balances remaining available as of such date of enactment of the amounts made available under title I of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act (Public Law 110-343; 12 U.S.C. 5211 et seq.) that have been allocated for use under the FHA Refinance Program (pursuant to Mortgagee Letter 2010-23 of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development) of the Making Home Affordable initiative of the Secretary of the Treasury shall be available to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for carrying out a program for insuring mortgages made to refinance existing mortgages on 1- to 4-family residences, in accordance with such guidelines and standards as the Secretary shall issue, which shall provide that under such program—

(1) the residence subject to a mortgage being refinanced and to the insured refinancing mortgage shall be the principal residence of the mortgagor;

(2) the mortgagor under the insured refinancing mortgage shall have an annual family income not exceeding $180,000;

(3) the insured refinancing mortgage shall have a term to maturity of 30 years;

(4) the insured refinancing mortgage shall bear interest at a single rate of 4.0 percent annually for the entire term of the mortgage; and

(5) the mortgagor under the insured refinancing mortgage may not have failed to timely make any payments due under the mortgage being refinanced.

H.R. 836

OFFERED BY: MR. PAULSEN

AMENDMENT NO: 3: Page 5, line 23, strike ''AND''.

Page 5, line 24, before the period insert the following: '', AND MEMBERS AND VETERANS WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES AND THEIR FAMILIES''.

Page 6, line 19, strike ''or''.

Page 6, line 25, strike the period and insert ''; or''.

Page 6, after line 25, insert the following:

(D) such members and veterans of the Armed Forces who have service-connected injuries, and survivors and dependents of such members and veterans of the Armed Forces with such injuries.

H.R. 836

OFFERED BY: MS. WATERS

AMENDMENT NO. 4: At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 4. PUBLICATION OF MEMBER AVAILABILITY FOR ASSISTANCE.

Not later than 5 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall publish to its Website on the World Wide Web in a prominent location, large point font, and boldface type the following statement: ''The Emergency Mortgage Relief Program, which would have provided unemployed homeowners with low-interest loans to assist them in paying their mortgage, has been terminated. If you are unemployed and concerned about not being able to pay your mortgage, please contact your Member of Congress for assistance.''.

H.R. 836

OFFERED BY: MR. CANSECO

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Page 4, line 22, after the period insert the following: ''All such unobligated balances so rescinded and permanently canceled shall be retained in the General Fund of the Treasury for reducing the debt of the Federal Government.''.

H.R. 836

OFFERED BY: MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

AMENDMENT NO. 6: Page 6, line 19, strike ''or''.

Page 6, line 25, strike the period and insert ''; or''.

Page 6, after line 25, insert the following:

(D) a teacher in an elementary or secondary school.

H.R. 836

OFFERED BY: MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT NO. 7: At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, this Act shall take effect on, and any reference in this Act to the date of the enactment of this Act shall be construed to refer to, the first date occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act on which the Current Population Survey (CPS) of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, as released monthly, identifies that the unemployment rate for the United States is equal to 7.5 percent or less.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 2011 No. 35

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Hear our prayers, O God. Attend to our intercession. You are the rock of our hope, our refuge in the time of storm. Forgive the things that blemish our personal lives, leading us away from Your standards of purity. Forgive us for every action that obstructs the coming of Your kingdom.

Today, help the Members of this body to experience the constancy of Your presence. Lord, fill them with the higher wisdom that leads a nation toward greatness. Show them what needs to be changed and give them the courage to do it. Sustain them by the radiant vision of the ultimate triumph of Your kingdom.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUYE).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 9, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, following any leader remarks, there will be a period of morning business until 10:40, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each. The majority will control the first half and the Republicans will control the final half.

At 10:40 a.m., the Senate will recess for a joint meeting of Congress with the Honorable Julia Gillard, Prime Minister of Australia.

The Senate will reconvene at 12 noon and proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 1, the Defense appropriations bill, which is the famous CR, H.R. 1, and the Democratic alternative.

At 3 p.m., Senators should expect two rollcall votes in relation to those two matters. Under an agreement reached yesterday, each proposal will be subject to a 60-vote threshold.

NOT JUST NUMBERS

Mr. REID. Madam President, on the news on the way to work this morning, I heard one Republican Senator who is part of the Republican leadership say he thought all Republicans would vote for H.R. 1, this job-killing—that isn't what he said, it is what I say—this job-killing, shortsighted bill. He said they would do it because of the numbers involved in it—the numbers involved in it. I tell everyone, my friends on the Republican side, the American people are not as concerned about the numbers as what is in this bill, with those mean-spirited riders.

We are concerned about the numbers. The American people are concerned about the numbers. The President of the United States and Democratic Senators have agreed to address the numbers, and we will do that. We have done it in our alternative here today.

But this is not a bill about numbers. H.R. 1 is a mean-spirited bill that will cut the heart out of the recovery we have in America today. It goes after little children, poor little boys and girls who want to learn—they don't know what they want, but we want them to learn to read, to be able to learn. Head Start is a program that has been successful. We have a lot of poor people in Nevada. I wish we didn't, but we do. Head Start has been great for our communities. The National Institutes of Health, they are whacking that—the National Science Foundation. Our clean energy jobs, they are going after them. National laboratories. Where is the spirit of Pete Domenici—Pete Domenici, a long-time Republican Senator. He and I worked as chair and ranking member of that Energy and Water Subcommittee on Appropriations, trying to fund those very important labs. The labs do lots of good. Among others, they make our country's nuclear weapons safe and reliable. What has been done with this meat axe approach that they say is only numbers is not good for our country. I have heard my friend, the assistant majority leader, talk about what is happening to one of the smaller laboratories, Argonne, in Illinois. We have big ones at Livermore, at Sandia, Los Alamos, and other labs around the country that are some of the places where there is pure science—some of the few places in America today where we have pure science. What H.R. 1 has done, what they are trying to do to

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

education in our country—not only Head Start—but how it affects education generally is unacceptable.

What this bill would do if it were to pass—it is not numbers; it is not numbers only. What does it do to our port security? The Presiding Officer is from the State of New York. Every day there are evil people trying to do damage to the people and the State of New York in the ports. Our airport security. We still have to look out for these bad people, the shoe bombers and other people who come up with all of these very bad ways to try to harm America.

So for someone over here on the other side to say they are looking at H.R. 1 and they will probably all vote for it because of the numbers—how insulting to the American people.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10:40 a.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half.

The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

AUTHORIZATION TO APPOINT ESCORT COMMITTEE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the President pro tempore of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort the Honorable Julia Gillard, Prime Minister of Australia, to the House Chamber for the joint meeting.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESPONSIBLE DEFICIT REDUCTION

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I wish to follow up on what was said by the majority leader. This exercise we are engaged in here, this conversation about how to finish this fiscal year which ends on October 1, is one that I think has gotten out of hand, and I will tell you why.

I know the debt is a serious problem facing America. I know the deficit is something that threatens our economy and our way of living. I also know there are sensible, thoughtful ways to deal with it. One of them was addressed by the Bowles-Simpson deficit commission which I served on and voted for in terms of their final report. I disagreed with some things, but that is the nature of a compromise and the nature of moving our Nation forward. What we tried to do in that commission was to take a look at this challenge and not solve it in a month or 6 months, but say, How can we solve this, do it in a sensible, responsible way, and still grow the economy?

Right now, a few feet away from where we are meeting, are some of the best minds in America. They are sitting in a room, meeting with Senators. They represent the high-tech industries of America. I just heard Mr. John Chambers, who is the CEO of Cisco, talk about the challenge we face and compare our status in the world to China today, the No. 2 economy in the world. He compared our situation today to what it was a few years ago.

We are in a position now where we have only one out of four startup companies that we had a few years ago, and it is an indication to me that if America is going to continue to lead in this world, we need to invest in that which makes us strong. I am not saying the deficit is not a problem. It is. But we will still have a Federal budget as we address the deficit and we should invest, through that Federal budget, in what is important, things that build our future.

This morning Senator REID of Nevada talked about the vulnerable in America. Well, I couldn't agree more. We don't hear the words ''safety net'' around here anymore, and it is unfortunate, because we know that even in this prosperous society there are many unfortunate people. There are children who, through no fault of their own, were born into dysfunctional and poor families, kids whom we try to rescue from their plight and engage them in Head Start, to bring them into a learning atmosphere, a classroom. I have been there, all over my State of Illinois. I was there two weeks ago in Chicago. I went into one of the poorest sections of that great city and saw a room full of 40 of some of the cutest kids in the world from struggling families who were lucky enough to be in the Head Start Program. It means that for the better part of the day, they are in a safe, positive, learning environment. Is that a good thing? Of course it is. Whether it is my son or daughter or your son or daughter, it comes down to the basics. If we don't give our children the right lift-off in their lives, many of them struggle and, unfortunately, many fail.

So when the House Republicans say the way to deal with our deficit is to cut hundreds of thousands of these poor children out of the Head Start Program and to dismiss tens of thousands of teachers and staff, we have to step back and say, Are you sure? Has it reached that point? Are we at a point now where we have to deny these children access to the kind of learning experience that makes their school experience later on more successful? I don't think so.

An honest look at our deficit would not just go after education and research and investment in our infrastructure. It would look across the board, as the Bowles-Simpson commission did. How can we rationalize at this moment in time cutting Head Start for hundreds of thousands of kids across America, denying money to the poorest school districts in America where they literally struggle day to day to try to turn around the lives of children who are in very dire circumstances?

The House Republicans have suggested cutting Pell grants. Pell grants. Those are the grants given to college students from lower income families. I look back on my life and I guess I was one of those kids. My mother was a widow and I wanted to go to college, and it wasn't a family experience. I needed help. In those days, Pell grants didn't exist, but college loans did, and the Federal college loan came to my rescue.

Well, here I stand today because of that. And for hundreds and thousands of students across America, the Pell grants are their ticket to college. That is how they can get into college, earn a diploma, and succeed in life. When the House Republicans say we have reached the point where we have to cut that assistance to college students across America, you say to yourself, Is it that bad that we have to reach that far?

Let me suggest there are other efforts we ought to look at first. I happen to believe in this great, prosperous Nation that the most prosperous among us—the wealthiest, the people who have benefited the most from this great Nation—can be asked to sacrifice more. I think they should. Asking those at the highest income levels in America to pay more in taxes at this point in our history is not unreasonable and it is not going to kill the economy, and it is simple economic justice. If doing that means we can protect the most vulnerable and protect opportunity for education, I think that is fair.

I also question some of what we are doing. Look at the price of gasoline at gas stations across America today and then watch the next quarterly earnings report of the oil companies and tell me why we continue to funnel billions of taxpayers' dollars into subsidies for the oil companies. They are doing quite well, thank you. They don't need a subsidy that adds to our deficit. The same thing is true in my home State of Illinois. Let me get personal about this. I happen to believe that agriculture is critical to our Nation. I believe we need to be there as a safety net for farmers who can't predict what the weather will be or what crop prices might be, but there are parts of our ag

program that, frankly, need to be seriously reviewed and the Federal contribution needs to be reduced. At a time when commodity prices are the highest and farms are the most prosperous and profitable, the fact that we are sending so much money out of the Treasury to some of the largest farms in America is indefensible.

So I am bringing it home to the agricultural State of Illinois and to our Nation when it comes to oil and gas and saying that before we cut money for research, as the House Republicans suggest, at the National Institutes of Health, before we deny to doctors and scientists and the best minds in America the resources they need to find cures for diseases, to find the next wonder drug that will revolutionize life in America—before we do that, let's take an honest look at this entire budget. The House Republican budget goes too far.

Let me also raise a point relative to my own appropriations subcommittee. We have funded three watchdog agencies to make sure we never, ever enter another recession like the one we are in now. After Wall Street brought the economy to its knees, sent millions of hard-working Americans to the unemployment line, and took $700 billion from taxpayers—you will remember that $700 billion in bailout funds—the House Republicans are now fighting to prevent the cops from getting on the beat, those who are going to be there to make sure Wall Street can never wreak this damage again.

The Securities and Exchange Commission was tasked by our Wall Street reform bill to write new rules to bring more transparency to the stock markets. The House Republican budget would cut $231 billion from the Securities and Exchange Commission's budget compared to what the bill authorized. That is an 18-percent cut at the very time when this agency should be beefing up its ranks to keep an eye on what is happening on Wall Street and writing new rules for enforcement.

That may be good news for future Bernie Madoffs but not for investors and families across America who count on Wall Street and financial institutions across America to deal honestly.

The Commodity Futures Trading Commission was tasked by the same Wall Street bill to bring some sunshine to what Warren Buffet called ''financial weapons of mass destruction, the credit default swaps and other derivatives that are mostly traded on shadowy over-the-counter markets today.

The House Republican budget would cut $174 million from the CFTC, compared to what the Senate Appropriations Committee recommended. That is a 69-percent cut, at the very moment when the CFTC needs better technology and many more investigators to handle its awesome responsibilities.

Then there is a third cut in the House Republican budget. They cut the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. It is brand new, created by the Wall Street reform bill. The budget the House Republicans are pushing would cap the funding for the CFPB at half of what it should receive from the Federal Reserve under the Wall Street reform bill.

Since the day I introduced the first bill to create this bureau—in a different form but a similar goal—with the help of Elizabeth Warren, a professor from Harvard Law School, the House Republicans have fought to defeat this idea.

When President Obama signed the bill into law, the reformers—the people who want Americans to have access to financial services they understand to use to improve their lives—won.

As the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee with the responsibility for funding these agencies, I have done my best to make sure they have adequate funds to protect American investors and maintain the sterling reputation of our financial institutions on Wall Street.

As an early champion of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, I am going to continue that fight to make sure this agency has the power and resources it needs.

I will close by saying there is such a stark contrast in the vote that we will have today. We are going to be asked on the Senate floor whether Members want to vote for H.R. 1, the House Republican budget. The majority leader reminded us it is not just a spending bill; it is a bill that is fraught with every bumper sticker issue you can remember over the last 10 years.

The Republicans don't want to just cut spending, they want to inject themselves into the national debate on a myriad of issues. They want to take the spending bill and debate abortion, and they want to debate whether we will provide Federal funds for family planning, for Planned Parenthood across America. They want this spending bill to take funding away from National Public Radio and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. They want this spending bill to take one-third of the resources from the EPA, which needs to make sure the air we breathe and the water we drink are fit for ourselves and our families.

That is what they are doing. You think to yourself, if this is about an economic emergency and budget emergency, why did the House Republicans let it devolve into this situation where it has become a cat fight over political issues? We can do better. The American people expect us to do better. I am still meeting with five other Senators—three Republicans and two other Democrats. We are trying to take the Bowles-Simpson Commission and build this into a thoughtful effort that will reduce our deficit in a meaningful way. It will take time. We are not going to finish in 6 or 7 months or lurching 2 weeks at a time this Federal Government. We need to address our responsibilities—the responsibilities to build this economy and, No. 2, to put America's fiscal house in order. We can do that, but we need to get beyond the current level of political fighting into a more constructive level. I hope this bipartisan group I am part of will be part of the solution ultimately. In the meantime, we will continue our efforts.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, our Nation's budget is a statement of our values, our priorities, and our vision for what kind of country we will be handing off to our children and grandchildren.

Working together to pass a responsible and forward-looking budget that works for the American people is one of the most important jobs we have in the Senate. The outcome of this process we are talking about will affect millions of families across our country, and the decisions we make this week are going to go a long way toward determining if our economy is going to continue moving in the right direction.

This morning I want to speak about two very different budgets being debated today, with two very different statements about what we should be focused on as a country, and two very different visions for how we need to be positioned to compete successfully and win the future.

This should not be a partisan process. I am still hopeful we can work together on a budget plan that cuts spending responsibly and works for the American people. But I am extremely disappointed that Republicans, who came into office talking about the economy, have proposed an extreme budget that would destroy hundreds of thousands of jobs, devastate workers and small businesses across the country, and threaten that fragile economic recovery.

I am disappointed that at a time when so many middle-class families still need support to get back on their feet after the Wall Street crisis Republicans have proposed a highly politicized slash-and-burn budget that will pull the rug out from families and children.

I am disappointed that while the Senate Democratic proposal makes responsible and practical budget cuts that will allow us to continue out-innovating, out-educating, and out-building our competitors, Republicans are proposing a budget that would hack away at these estimates across the board and threaten our Nation's ability to compete now and into the future.

We are going to hear a lot about big numbers today, and I will mention some myself. I think it is important we keep in mind that this debate is about

more than dollars and cents; it is about real people with real lives.

I recently heard from the South Central Workforce Development Council in Washington State, and they told me about a man they worked with named Damon.

Damon had been laid off from his job testing machine equipment. He held that job for almost 10 years. He and his wife had to move back in with his father, and he said that no matter how hard he tried he could not find work that matched his skills.

Damon had to do something about it. He went to his local one-stop career center and sat down with counselors who talked him through what local employers were looking for, and he decided he was going to learn computer networking. He studied hard and graduated from a local computer technology program. Despite this tough economy, he was able to work with the one-stop center to find a new job in a new field.

Damon was able to get back on his feet and support his family because of this program. He is not alone. Millions of Americans depend on workforce training programs to get the skills they need to get back to work and help our economy grow, including nearly 400,000 in my State of Washington.

House Republicans have proposed eliminating these critical programs and cutting off services for the workers who depend on them. At a time when so many workers are fighting to get back on the job, this would be devastating.

I recently met with a woman named Tiffany from Chehalis, WA. She told me her stepson, Rodney, had some difficult family circumstances and had fallen behind his peers and that she and her husband could not afford the private education they thought he needed to catch up. Then she heard about Head Start from a friend and enrolled Rodney in that program.

Tiffany told me she saw the difference within a few months. Just a short time later, Rodney was ready for kindergarten, and he is now the top reader in his first grade class. Tiffany and her family got the support they needed and they, too, are far from being alone.

Nearly 1 million families and their children depend on Head Start. The Republican proposal we will be voting on this afternoon eliminates services for 218,000 children, including more than 3,000 in my home State. It will close 16,000 classrooms across the country, and it will cause up to 55,000 teachers and staff to lose their jobs.

Again, this extreme slash-and-burn approach is wrong. It would hurt the most vulnerable of our children and families in our country and leave us at a competitive disadvantage in the future.

The Republican proposal also slashes community development block grants by 62 percent. That would eliminate services and decimate housing and economic development programs in communities across our country.

It cuts the community health centers so many Americans depend on for their health care, eliminating funding outright for 127 clinics in 38 States, reducing services at over 1,000 centers nationwide, cutting off health care for almost 3 million Americans that will cause 5,000 workers across our country to lose their jobs.

Not only will the Republican proposal devastate middle-class families across this country, it would also halt the beginning of an economic recovery that our families and our small business owners desperately need to take root.

Last month, our economy added over 200,000 private sector jobs, and the unemployment rate fell to the lowest level in 2 years.

We have a long way to go, but I am confident that we have turned the corner and are beginning to move in the right direction. Economists on both the left and the right have come out and said if the Republican proposal from the House were to pass, the economic recovery and millions of jobs across the country would be threatened.

In fact, one independent analysis said the Republican plan could destroy up to 700,000 American jobs in this country, including an estimated 15,000 in my State of Washington. That would be devastating, and we cannot afford to let that happen.

That is why the Senate Democratic proposal would take our country in a very different direction. It would cut spending—billions of dollars, in fact—but it would do so in a responsible and practical way that would protect our middle-class families, those who need it most.

Our proposal continues to make the investments we need as a country to compete and win in the 21st-century economy. Take the highly successful TIGER Program that I helped create. Communities across our country have been competing very hard for resources from this program so they can invest in transportation projects that make significant contributions to the Nation, to their region, or their metropolitan area.

Today, the TIGER Program is putting workers on the job and helping to lay down a strong foundation for economic growth in this country. But the Republican proposal would not only eliminate that program completely and slam the door on communities that want to invest in their infrastructure, it would also take back every penny of funding—all funding already—promised in last year's budget. That will halt 75 projects in 40 States that are ready to go and put 33,000 jobs at risk. It doesn't make any sense. The Democratic proposal would protect that critical investment.

The Republican proposal would also jeopardize public health and the environment by gutting the laws that keep our air and water clean. It cuts nearly $2 billion in funding for clean water infrastructure, which our local communities need to keep our families safe, so when you turn on that water in your kitchen you will know it is safe. It slashes the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which, by the way, uses revenue from offshore oil leases to protect some of the most treasured places in our country. But that is not all. The extreme Republican proposal would also slash investments for students and children, including a $700 million cut to title I funding, which will affect 2,400 schools serving over 1 million students. It cuts Pell grants by 15 percent, which will make it so much harder for kids to go to college today.

The House Republican proposal would even slash some of the bipartisan programs we have created to keep our families safe, including 66 percent cuts to both the Transit Security Grant Program that helps make sure our trains and subways are safe, as well as the Port Security Grant Program that helps protect our critical economic and national security assets across the country. That does not make sense. If a terrorist attack were to occur at one of our ports or transit systems, it would be absolutely devastating for our families and our economy, which is why the Democratic proposal protects these critical investments.

Those are just a few of the examples of the radical and irresponsible cuts that are proposed in the Republican budget.

We, of course, need to cut spending. We need to bring down the deficit. We all agree on that point. But we have to do it responsibly, and we cannot do it on the backs of our middle-class families who are struggling.

I urge my colleagues this afternoon to support the Democratic proposal, and if we cannot pass something today, I urge my Republican colleagues to come to the table and work with us to pass a responsible long-term budget that really does reflect our priorities, gets our workers back on the job, and invests in America's future.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING AND FREE-TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, later today Senators will have an opportunity to take a position on government spending. At a time when Washington is borrowing about $4 billion a day, Democratic leaders want to cut about $4.5 billion in government spending for the rest of this fiscal year and call it a day. In other words, they want to take what amounts to a day-and-a-

half long holiday from their out-of-control spending and then return to the status quo for the rest of the year.

Let me add that paying lipservice to the threat caused by the deficit is not a substitute for responsible leadership and that the job-destroying tax hikes on small businesses and American families are not the answer to out-of-control Washington spending. At a time when increasing gas prices are already threatening our economic recovery, a minivan tax that some on the other side have proposed will not solve our Nation's fiscal crisis. But I will tell you what it will do. It will destroy jobs and impose a real burden on families every time they fill up at the pump—at a time when people are looking for relief instead.

Democrats' steadfast refusal to cut another dime from the bloated Washington budget has left them no choice, it seems, but to propose raising taxes on American families and small businesses so they can continue spending at unsustainable levels. Republicans, on the other hand, have made a serious proposal to rein in wasteful spending. To me, at least, the choice before us is pretty clear.

As we approach today's vote, it is worth noting that even if we were to pass the biggest spending cuts that have been proposed so far in this debate, it would not even put a dent in the fiscal problems we face as a result of the growth in entitlement spending. Think about it. Democrats have been waging war this week over a proposal to cut $4.7 billion. Meanwhile, the amount of money we have promised to spend on programs such as Social Security and Medicare—money we do not have—is about $52 trillion.

This week's debate is just a dress rehearsal for the big stuff, and so far Democrats are showing they are just not up to it. They either lack the stomach or the courage, and the President, as members of his own party point out, is nowhere to be found on this issue. I have talked about this leadership vacuum repeatedly this week on the entitlements and how their unchecked growth threatens to bury all of us in red ink before we know it. We can argue about whether to cut $5 billion or $60 billion in day-to-day expenses all we want, but the fact is, even if we hit the bigger number, we are still staring at a catastrophe. And the President appears to be totally uninterested—uninterested—in leading us to a bipartisan solution the way Ronald Reagan and Bill Clinton did the last time we faced a crisis of this magnitude.

When it comes to another crisis, the jobs crisis, the President is not just failing to lead, he is flatout barring the door with a mountain of stifling new regulations and calculated inaction on outstanding free-trade agreements with Colombia and Panama.

This morning, the U.S. Trade Representative is set to testify before the Finance Committee to voice the administration's support of a trade agreement with South Korea. While we support the administration's position on South Korea, the lack of leadership on these two other countries which signed free-trade agreements with us more than 3 years ago is completely disheartening. The reason for inaction is stunning. Union bosses do not want to see them passed. For some reason, they seem to think that expanding the market for U.S. goods into Colombia and Panama somehow hurts them, which is absurd, absolutely absurd. The administration has previously expressed tepid support for these deals, an acknowledgment that expanding markets for U.S. goods can only help U.S. workers and that the picture in Colombia is better than the labor bosses would have us believe, but they have failed to follow through.

The irony of union opposition to these trade deals is that an expanded U.S. presence in Latin America can only help the workers there by exporting U.S. business standards and practices, and, of course, more exports for U.S. firms means more jobs for U.S. workers in the United States.

In the last few weeks, company after company has come before Congress to testify how important accessing Latin American markets is for their future and to create jobs right in America. According to the chamber of commerce, failing to pass these trade agreements, along with the trade agreement with South Korea, could cost us 380,000 U.S. jobs.

While we dither on these agreements, Colombia has moved on. Having been stiff-armed by the United States, it is finding other trade partners. Naturally, Colombia has turned to other countries and, worse, still is warming relations with Hugo Chavez in neighboring Venezuela. Last week, Colombia President Juan Manuel Santos was quoted referring to Chavez as his ''new best friend''—a man who just last year accused Santos of plotting to assassinate him.

At a time when nearly 14 million Americans are looking for work, the President should be listening to those of us who come to him with ways to create jobs. And this is one of them. The administration has no excuse for failing to act on these trade agreements. It is in the interest of our country to approve them. It would create jobs at home at a time when we desperately need them. I am confident Congress could pass these on a bipartisan basis today.

I urge the administration to act today, and not just on South Korea but on Colombia and Panama. I, for one, am prepared to do everything in my power to pass these agreements, all of them together, this year.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHANNS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CAP AND TRADE

Mr. JOHANNS. Madam President, I rise today to talk about the administration's ill-advised cap-and-trade agenda and to support a bipartisan bill that I cosponsored. The Energy Tax Prevention Act would stop EPA from going around Congress and using regulations to implement the administration's failed cap-and-trade agenda. The bill is necessary because the administration is marching ahead with its cap-and-trade agenda even though the American people clearly want to focus on job creation, not policies that destroy jobs.

For evidence that the administration is marching ahead, one need only look at the President's budget. It clearly states ''continues to support greenhouse gas emissions reductions in the United States in the range of 17 percent below 2005 levels by 2020 and 83 percent by 2050.'' Not surprisingly, these reductions are nearly identical to those proposed in the Waxman-Markey House cap-and-trade bill. Americans rejected that legislation because it would have increased taxes on everyone—anyone who turns on a light switch, buys American-made products, fills up their gas tank.

The Energy Tax Prevention Act would prevent the administration from using its regulatory powers to circumvent Congress and implement this energy tax that Americans rejected last year. It is about protecting jobs—manufacturing jobs, for example—and it puts Congress back in the driver's seat in charge of energy policy, taking it back from unelected bureaucrats at the too-often overreaching EPA.

Above all, this bill rejects the notion that placing additional energy tax burdens on Americans is good policy. As the price of oil climbs and gas prices follow, our bill says: Don't hit Americans with another tax. Make no mistake, cap-and-trade policies would drive up the cost of everything, transportation fuels and electricity leading the way. Nobody disagrees with this understanding. In fact, the central policy mechanism of all of these proposals is making the use and production of fossil fuels more expensive.

The Congressional Budget Office has weighed in on this issue, and they put it this way:

> . . . a cap-and-trade program would thus lead to price increases for energy and energy-intensive goods and services . . . Such price increases would stem from the restriction on emissions . . . Indeed, the price increases would be essential to the success of a cap-and-trade program.

In other words, these efforts are designed to make oil, gas, and coal-fired electricity more expensive, and the

same is true for the EPA's regulatory plan. Gas prices will go up, electricity will go up, farm input costs will go up, consumers will pay more, and U.S. manufacturing will get crushed under the heavy hand of the EPA. Meanwhile, our overseas competitors, unfettered by the cap, will gobble up market share and hurt those providing good-paying jobs in this country. Our farmers and ranchers will not be spared either. The cost of running pivot irrigation will go up. Nebraska has thousands of them. Diesel fuel for tractors and combines will go up. The price tag on fertilizer that farmers need to grow crops will skyrocket.

Some of my constituents might be saying: I am not a farmer, I am not a manufacturer, so I am not affected. Unfortunately, no American can escape the reach of this ill-advised regulatory effort. Because refineries are first targeted in EPA's regulatory schedule, because electrical plants are first targeted, electric bills and the cost of fuel will go up. If you think gas prices are high now, brace yourself—more price hikes are coming. And if you think your electric bill at the end of the month is already plenty high, look out for EPA's energy tax.

Believe it or not, the Obama administration has made it clear that these higher prices are exactly, precisely what the doctor ordered. During the Presidential campaign, President Obama famously said—he was really up-front:

> Under my plan, electricity bills would necessarily skyrocket.

Citizens probably entered the voting booth with the false hope that we in Congress would never let that happen. Sadly, the Obama administration has made it clear that they intend to work around Congress. Energy Secretary Steven Chu even told the Wall Street Journal in September of 2008:

> Somehow we have to figure out how to boost the price of gasoline to the levels of Europe.

That is not my vision for America. And with gasoline over $7 per gallon in places such as Germany and France, I doubt many Americans share that vision. Yet this administration has chosen to use the EPA to make gasoline expensive through its ill-advised energy tax plan. The EPA is literally targeting our fuel refineries when gas prices are headed to $4 per gallon and oil is over $100 a barrel. It doesn't make sense.

But just when we thought we saw a ray of hope, when the President said he wanted to slow down the regulatory freight train bearing down on the Nation's job creators, well, something happened. He said he wanted to reduce the regulatory burdens on small businesses. He even went so far as to put out an Executive order in January, and he instructed the agencies to review ''rules that have gotten out of balance, placing unreasonable burdens on business, burdens that have stifled innovation and have a chilling effect on growth and jobs.''

Well, unfortunately, the EPA apparently believes their greenhouse gas regulations are more important than job creation. The headline from the Hill newspaper says it all: ''EPA Confident Obama Reg Policy Won't Affect New Climate Rules.'' So the EPA, all powerful, quickly dismissed the Executive order saying: ''EPA is confident that our recent and upcoming steps to address GHG emissions under the Clean Air Act comfortably pass muster under the sensible standards the President laid out.''

In other words, the EPA believes, and continues to think, their regulatory cap-and-trade plan is not an unreasonable burden on consumers, small business, and job creators. One would have to suspend all rational thought to reach that conclusion. It is unbelievable. Here is the kicker: These EPA regulations will have no discernible impact on global temperatures.

Put simply, the EPA's agenda is all about more pain and no gain because the rules and regulations in the United States don't control places such as China, India, and Brazil, obviously. You see, global warming is called global warming for a reason. Yet it is our farmers, our ranchers, and our small businesses that will be saddled with the job-killing costs. American job creators will have one arm tied behind their back trying to compete. Even EPA Administrator Jackson admitted the House cap-and-trade bill would have negligible impact on global temperatures.

This is all unbelievably bad for America. It is no wonder the Senate roundly repudiated the idea last year. Yet the EPA charges forward. We must restore some measure of common sense. This bill is the right step, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

A SECOND OPINION

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor, as I do every week, as a physician who has practiced medicine and taken care of families in Wyoming for a quarter of a century, to give a doctor's second opinion of the health care law.

County commissioners from around the State of Wyoming are coming to town today for their annual meeting. It was 1 year ago today, at their annual meeting, when NANCY PELOSI—then-Speaker of the House—addressed that group and said: We have to pass the bill so you can find out what is in it.

That quote has been repeated again and again and again, and people now know what is in this health care law. People have found out. Every month since this law has been passed, people have found out additional things about the health care law they absolutely do not like. Now that the American people know what is in the bill, and they know they don't like it, let's get to the fundamentals of what the American people have asked for. When they asked for a change in health care in this country, they said they wanted the care they need from the doctor at a price they can afford. The new law fails that test, and it fails miserably.

It has only taken 1 year to break almost every promise the President made when he addressed the Congress and the country. So what I would like to do now is take a look, month by month, at how those promises were broken. I will start with March, since it is now March and this started with NANCY PELOSI's statement in March of 2010.

One year ago, the Congressional Budget Office evaluated the law to see how much it would actually cost. They told us the law could only reduce the deficit if it did something about the long-term insolvency of Medicare. Instead, the Democrats and the President proposed and adopted and signed into law cuts of over $500 billion from Medicare. This was not to save Medicare but to start a whole new government entitlement program, a decision the CBO said would increase the deficit by $260 billion.

Let's go to April. In April, we learned the costs for those Medicare cuts go way beyond dollars and cents. An analysis by the Department of Health and Human Services found these cuts could drive up to 15 percent of hospitals out of business. For this administration, the shortage of hospitals apparently takes a backseat to the shortage of Washington bureaucrats.

Let us go to May. In May, we learned over 200,000 Americans with preexisting conditions and expensive health insurance would not be eligible to enroll in the new high-risk pools created in the health care law; that is, of course, unless they were willing to completely drop the insurance they had and wait, without insurance—wait without insurance—for 6 months. Only then would they qualify for what was in the health care law. For many people with preexisting conditions, who were paying higher premiums, they felt that would be irresponsible behavior; that it would be risky, put them at financial risk. But that is what this administration and this government was proposing.

In June, after the administration sent over 4 million postcards to small businesses—you remember the postcards, the ones claiming those small businesses would be eligible for a tax credit—the Associated Press blew the whistle. It turned out the only small businesses that were fully eligible for these tax credits had to employ fewer than 25 people. So to be eligible at all, they had to have fewer than 25 people. Moreover, the Associated Press reported the tax credit drops off sharply if the company employs any more than 10 people or if the annual salary was averaging more than $25,000. So if you had 10 employees and paid them, on average, $25,000, you could get the tax credit. But once you went to that 11th employee and gave someone a raise,

you started to lose the attribute the administration said was so valuable.

That was in June. In July, the Obama administration's own Justice Department confirmed the individual mandate penalty is a tax increase. Well, when ABC News's George Stephanopoulos asked the President if the mandate penalty was a tax increase, the President said: ''I absolutely reject that notion.'' Well, if the President absolutely rejects the notion, why is his own Justice Department contradicting him?

In August, without so much as a hearing before Congress, the President made a recess appointment. He tapped Dr. Donald Berwick to run the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. So how big is this Federal agency? Well, it includes oversight of a budget larger than the Pentagon's. Dr. Berwick believes the government must ration health care and that the only issue is whether we ration with our eyes wide open, as he said. Well, the President promised not to ration care, so why did he make an appointment of someone who believes it is inevitable to ration care and do it in a way without ever allowing the Senate—Republicans and Democrats alike, Members of this body—to even have a hearing so this individual could explain his position, explain his previous comments, explain what he has said and written? The President refused and did a recess appointment of someone who never testified, never came to a confirmation hearing, and he put him in charge of a program with a budget larger than the Pentagon's. Can you imagine if the Secretary of Defense was made as a recess appointment without a congressional hearing? It is unthinkable.

In September, the administration released new rules estimating that 80 percent of small businesses would be forced to change the coverage of insurance they offer to their employees. These aren't my numbers, these are the administration's own numbers. But it was the President who said, over and over, if you like the coverage you have today, then you can keep it. Now we know that was another one of the President's empty promises.

In October, responding to complaints from unions and corporations, the Obama administration began handing out waivers—waivers that excused individual groups from ObamaCare's expensive mandates. These waivers went mostly to those politically connected to this administration. Most American families still have to bear the law's expensive burdens. Clearly, for this administration, playing favorites is more important than achieving fairness. I think every American ought to be able to get a waiver from this health care law.

In November, a majority of the American people voiced their opposition to this law and handed an election response that resulted in a significant change in the composition of the House and the Senate because the American people knew they did not want this health care law.

The American people were concerned—and they even wondered if this law was constitutional—and in December, a Federal judge in Virginia ruled it was unconstitutional to force Americans to buy a product. The Service Employees International Union, one of the biggest unions in the country, also admitted in December that fulfilling the requirements of ObamaCare would be financially impossible. This is the same law they said the country needed when they lobbied in favor of it.

In January of this year, the Medicare Actuary called the administration's claim the health care law would bring down costs ''false more than true.'' Also, a Federal judge in Florida struck down the entire law as unconstitutional.

In February—last month—we learned the 2012 budget the IRS submitted to Congress specifically mentions the health care law 250 times. They mention it as a source of authority and funding for new powers. They called the health care law ''the largest set of tax law changes in more than 20 years.'' To begin implementing these changes will require thousands of new Washington bureaucrats.

Well, that was through February, and here we are, on March 9. Did the American people find out anything new about the health care law in March? Absolutely. Last Friday night, the Secretary of Health and Human Services granted another 150 waivers—another 150 waivers. Now there are over 1,040 waivers covering 2.6 million individuals. These are people who don't want to live under the Obama health care law. They don't want it to apply to them. I think every American ought to have a right to that same waiver. Of those 2.6 million people who received waivers, 1.2 million are members of unions. So that is 46 percent of the waivers have been given to union members.

If you look at the Web site you must go to for that information, the Secretary has tried to disguise how they label these individuals, and so union plans are now called ''multiemployer plans.'' Under this change in the name, at the Web site you go to learn about this, are the words ''promoting transparency.'' So we have an administration that says one thing but does another.

But the American people now know what is in the law. As they were studying the law before the vote, they didn't want it. Now they know all about it, and they still don't want it. It is clear it is unsustainable, unaffordable, and unconstitutional. It is time to repeal and replace it.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

THE BUDGET

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I thank the Chair for allowing me the floor for a few minutes.

First, I wish to say, Dr. BARRASSO's second opinion is clearly the opinion of Missourians. I think when you ask Americans if they want to see changes in the health care system—but not these changes—they say: Yes, we want the health care system to be changed. We just don't want it changed this way.

I remind the Chair, in Missouri in the primary election in August last year, 72 percent of the people who voted said they did not want to be part of this health care plan. This is going to be a big discussion and a big issue for the next couple of years, until we decide what direction we are going to take.

Today I want to talk about spending. Two bills are coming to the floor today about spending and there will be lots of discussion about the cuts the House made, the $61 billion of cuts and how this cut could have been better, how this is a good thing for the government or for somebody to do. Of course, I suspect most all of that will be true. What is unfortunate is that we on the Senate floor today do not get to talk about what we might cut instead of these things, these things that will be discussed that people think are such a good idea for us to cut.

The truth is, we have to make the decisions that get spending under control. This year we are going to spend about $3.8 trillion and we are going to collect about $2.2 trillion. Even though ''trillion dollars'' is too big a concept to wrap your mind around, everybody understands that 3.8 is a lot bigger than 2.2. If your business was spending $3.8 million and bringing in $2.2 million, you would understand your business was not going to be in business very much longer. If your family was spending $38,000 and bringing in the door $22,000, you would know that could not continue. This cannot continue either.

The idea we cannot make $61 billion of reductions in spending in a $3.8 trillion budget, $1.6 trillion of which is deficit spending, doesn't make sense to me and it doesn't make sense to the American people. We are going to have to have a government that can make choices.

Right now we have government trying to do the same thing over and over at all three levels. Some of those things government is trying to do at the Federal, the State, and the local level ought to be left to families, where they could be left to families. Other things are the legitimate job of government. But everything is not the legitimate job of the Federal Government and almost nothing is the legitimate job of all levels of government. We would be much better off if we tried to go through this process: OK, is this a problem that only government can solve? If the answer is yes, then the next question is: Can't we solve that problem closer to where people live and

work, and where the problem is, where families are? Can't we solve that at the city level or the county level?

Maybe the answer is no. Then the question should be: Can't we solve it at the State level? Then the question should be: If we are going to solve it at the Federal level, is there a constitutional definition that allows us to do that?

There are some things that only the Federal Government can do. But there are not very many things that only the Federal Government can do.

We are going to hear in this discussion today and in the coming weeks about lots of good that can be done in our society. We are going to hear about some things I have worked to authorize and tried to get us to make a priority and still hope to keep a priority. Some of those programs are actually cut in the House appropriations bill that I will vote for today, because my view is we have to cut spending. If we could cut the $61 billion this year from exactly what I wanted to be cut, that would be better for me. But I am committed to cut spending in any bill we can get enough people to support, to put a bill on the President's desk that will say let's head toward a balanced budget. Let's get a balanced budget amendment. Let's head toward a balanced budget. But let's ask the right questions.

Before I came to the Congress, I was a university president for 4 years. It was a private university, Southwest Baptist University in Bolivar, MO. We did not take any Federal money or any State money. We had to pay our bills. Because we had to pay our bills, as the president of the university I was constantly being asked to do good things but I had several different categories of ''no, this is why we cannot do that.'' There are two that maybe we ought to use the most often in Washington, DC, these days. The first is: No, that is a good idea but it is not what we do. I said that a lot as the university president. As a matter of fact, in the 4 years I was there I never had anybody come to me and ask me to do anything evil. I never had anybody come to me as president of the Southwest Baptist University and say here is something bad I think we should do as an institution. Every idea I got was a good idea, but it was not always something we could do. So one of my categories of no was ''no, that's a good idea but it's not what we do.''

We are going to hear lots about people with challenges that somebody should help. But the Federal Government is $1.6 trillion in debt this year—this year; not the $14 trillion accumulated debt, $1.6 this year—over $200 billion last month. Last month's deficit was within striking range of the annual deficit for the 10 years that ended in 2008. We are now spending more in deficit spending in a month than for a decade we spent in a year. If you average out that 10 years it is very close to February—and by the way, February is the shortest month. That is the only month where we have 28 days of spending, and we set a record on monthly deficit spending for the United States of America that was almost equal to the average annual deficit of the previous 10 years.

Sometimes people came to me and they had a good idea that actually was something the university could do. Often, then, I would have to say: Yes, that is a good idea, we ought to think how we can do that, but you are going to have to help me figure out what we can stop doing so we can start doing this. This may in fact be a better thing than some of the things we are doing now, but we can't do everything. Families deal with this issue all the time. You cannot do everything, even if it would be good to see those things done.

The Federal Government is doing the wrong thing when it heads down a road where you are spending so much more than you are collecting. One obvious answer is let's collect more. I suppose if you went to the Congressional Budget Office and said what would the collection amount be for the Federal Government if the tax rate were 100 percent—since they do not do any dynamic scoring over there, they score as if tax policy doesn't matter—I guess they could add up all the payrolls of America and whatever they added up to, that is how much money the Federal Government could bring in if the tax rate were 100 percent.

But that would not happen. Frankly, the tax rate of collecting the $2.2 trillion is about all we ought to be collecting out of this economy. For the 65 years after World War II, the government spent an average of about $1 out of $5, the Federal Government, that the economy could create. Now we are spending $1 out of $4. There is a big difference in a country where the Federal Government alone spends 1 dollar out of 4 that the country can create in goods and services as opposed to 1 dollar out of 5. You are not going to get a lot more on the taxing side. So we have to make the reductions in spending.

Then you are going to hear we are making these reductions out of 12 percent or 15 percent of the budget. Is that fair?

First of all, that is the only part of the budget we can get to without significant legislative activity. That should be the next thing on our agenda. Let's talk about the 60 percent of the budget we normally do not even talk about where if you meet the definition of the program you get the money, and see if we can't figure out how to produce better results for fewer dollars. That is what everybody else in America has been thinking about for 20 years now.

If you are still in business in America and you are competing in a global economy, you have been thinking how do we get a better result for less money, not how do we spend more money. We need to be sure the government is as good as the people it serves in that regard. It is 12 or 15 percent of the budget where we are talking reducing spending by $61 billion. That would not begin to be nearly enough, if you apportion it out. That is about one-seventh of the budget. If you multiply that by seven, you are still well over $1 trillion short of where you need to be. We need to start by taking at least this much money out of that part of the budget and figure out how we can also make the government work better in the other 85 percent of the budget.

Today is what it is. Today is a discussion to prove, apparently, that we cannot do anything. We can't do what the majority of the Senate wants to do, we can't do what the majority in the House wants to do. Let me tell you what the majority in the House wants to do is a minimum entry level to solving this whole problem. I am going to vote for it today and I urge my colleagues to vote for it as well.

I yield the floor.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JULIA GILLARD, PRIME MINISTER OF AUSTRALIA

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 12 noon.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:40 a.m., recessed until 12 noon, and the Senate, preceded by the Secretary of the Senate, Nancy Erickson, and the Deputy Sergeant at Arms, Martina Bradford, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear an address to be delivered by the Honorable Julia Gillard, Prime Minister of Australia.

(For the address delivered by the Prime Minister of Australia, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives.)

Whereupon, at 12 noon, the Senate, having returned to its Chamber, reassembled and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. FRANKEN).

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 3 hours of debate, equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the amendment I introduced on Friday cuts $51 billion from the discretionary spending request submitted by the President for fiscal year 2011. If this amendment were agreed to as written, it would mean we would appropriate $51 billion less than the President felt was necessary for the government to carry out its duties.

I do not agree with every item this President or any President requests in their budget. But I also know the President's budget request did not contain $51 billion in frivolous or wasteful spending. The cuts necessary to reach the $51-billion level required difficult choices. This amendment makes real cuts to real programs.

Tens of thousands of Americans will feel the direct impact of the proposed cuts. But the cuts included in this amendment are based on hearings, testimony, and a thorough analysis of the current needs of every agency and department the committee funds. By contrast, the Republicans in the House have thrown together a proposal based not on budgets, not on hearings, not on the demonstrated needs of agencies and departments but rather based on the campaign promise to reduce spending by $100 billion.

H.R. 1 shows clearly what happens when you run a bill based not on analysis but on campaign speeches. Therefore, today, the Senate finds itself responding to draconian cuts that would lead to furloughs, disrupt the delivery of government agencies and services, and harm America's children, our students, our working class, and our seniors. An estimated 700,000 jobs would be lost.

All this pain delivered in the name of deficit reduction and growing the economy. Yet the facts are clear. This is the wrong direction for our Nation.

We face our current fiscal situation primarily because of falling revenues brought about by unpaid-for tax cuts, especially for the wealthiest Americans, and because of ever-rising entitlement costs. Every nonpartisan report on finding a solution to our current fiscal crisis stresses the need for a comprehensive solution, a solution that includes cuts in discretionary spending, both defense and nondefense, as well as cuts in entitlement spending, and, yes, the need for additional revenues.

Just yesterday, the New York Times published a story about the efforts of the junior Senator from Virginia and the senior Senator from Georgia to honestly examine what it will take to solve our fiscal challenges. According to that story, even if Congress cut discretionary spending to zero, the senior Senator from Georgia was quoted as saying: ''We still couldn't solve the problem.''

I could not agree more. The solution to deficit reduction will not come from huge cuts to a small portion of the Federal budget. But that is what the House is proposing. What H.R. 1 will do instead is jeopardize the economic recovery we are beginning to see.

This Democratic alternative attempts to make the best of a very bad situation. The top line numbers tell a story. In this amendment, we are $23 billion below the President's request for nonsecurity spending, and we are $28 billion below his original request for spending related to our Nation's security.

For the Department of Defense alone, we have reduced spending by $19.4 billion, including a reduction of $2.1 billion for military construction, and $17.3 billion for the rest of the Defense Department. At this level, the bill is nearly $3 billion below the amounts proposed by the House for these activities. The recommended amounts will cover our defense requirements in this constrained fiscal environment.

However, my colleagues should all understand that with our troops still serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, this is not the time to be looking to defense for additional reductions. I feel that not all Members understand the depths of the cuts we have had to take to get $51 billion under the request.

They should be advised, for example, that the Senate amendment cuts $355 million of State and local law enforcement grants. This will result in some 1,400 fewer local and tribal law enforcement and criminal justice jobs. In addition, the amendment cuts $526 million from FBI salaries and expenses. These cuts will halt new national security enhancements intended to improve our intelligence and counterterrorism capabilities to protect U.S. information and technology networks from cyber attacks and to assist in litigation of intelligence and terrorism cases.

This amendment cuts science funding by $573 million at the National Science Foundation and by $165 million at the National Institute of Standards and Technology. As a result, the Nation will lose opportunities for promising research in emerging fields such as cyber security and nanotechnology. Instead of taking the lead, as we have always done, we will slow down, allowing the rest of the world to catch up.

When it comes to the critical area of education, the Senate amendment eliminates 17 individual education programs totaling $370 million. It cuts all Federal funding specifically targeted to education technology, gifted and talented instruction, and family literacy. The list goes on and on. But as significant as these cuts are, they stand in strong contrast to the House Republican bill, which includes such severe measures that the bill would undermine our security, endanger our economy, while costing hundreds of thousands of American jobs.

H.R. 1 would cut transit security grants by 66 percent, despite the fact that there have been over 1,300 attacks, killing or injuring over 18,000 people worldwide on trains and subways over the last 7 years. The Senate bill would maintain the fiscal year 2010 enacted level of $300 million.

The House Republican CR cuts discretionary funding for community health centers by $1 billion compared to the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. This cut would prevent any new clinic from opening. It will eliminate funds for 127 clinics currently operating in 38 States and reduce current services at another 1,096 centers across the country. More than 2.8 million people will likely lose access to their current primary care provider, and over 5,000 health center staff would lose their jobs. The Senate bill restores the $1 billion cut, preserving both the vital services being provided today and the planned expansion of centers estimated to treat over 7½ million new patients this year.

The House CR would eliminate all funding for the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery ''TIGER'' Grant Program. TIGER grants are highly competitive and fund transportation projects that make a significant contribution to the Nation, a region or a metropolitan area. The House proposal would take funding away from 75 projects in 40 States across the country. Based on information from the Transportation Department, cutting a total of $1.2 billion from the TIGER Program will put 33,360 jobs at risk.

H.R. 1 cuts funding for the Social Security Administration administrative expense by $125 million below the 2010 level. This would cause the SSA to freeze hiring across the agency and possibly furlough employees at a time when the number of Americans filing for disability and retirement benefits is at record levels. The Senate bill, by contrast, provides $600 million more than the House Republican proposal. Compared to the House CR, it will allow SSA to process about 300,000 more initial disability claims and 150,000 more disability hearings and prevent delays in new beneficiaries receiving their retirement benefits.

The House bill slashes title I education funding by nearly $700 million, meaning 2,400 schools serving 1 million disadvantaged students could lose funding, and approximately 10,000 teachers and aides would lose their jobs. At a time when schools across the Nation are already struggling with budget cuts, the title I grants program serves as the foundation of Federal assistance to elementary and secondary schools across the country, providing financial assistance to more than 90 percent of our Nation's school districts.

Finally, with regard to our Nation's security interests, the devastating funding cuts in H.R. 1 undermine our ability to stabilize Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq and to support General Petraeus's counterinsurgency strategy. H.R. 1 provides $5.71 billion for the Economic Support Fund, a 27-percent cut from the fiscal year 2011 request level.

As both Secretary Gates and Secretary Clinton have made clear in repeated testimony before Congress, cuts

of this magnitude will seriously impede efforts to stabilize Afghanistan and to transition responsibility for U.S. operations in Iraq from the military to civilians.

There are many more examples of damage that would come should H.R. 1 be enacted into law, which is why the President has promised a veto and why I know all my Democratic colleagues will reject it when it comes up for a vote.

The Senate amendment I offer takes a responsible approach to funding the government for the remainder of the fiscal year, making difficult decisions but also ensuring minimal disruptions to the economic recovery.

We are now almost halfway through fiscal year 2011, If we are to have any chance of avoiding another series of continuing resolutions for fiscal year 2012, we simply must finish our work on the current year and move past this issue. Therefore, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support my amendment as a prudent alternative to the House measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following explanatory statement regarding Division A of my Amendment No. 149, The Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011.

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

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUYE REGARDING DIVISION A OF SA 149, THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

REPROGRAMMING GUIDANCE

For fiscal year 2011, the Department of Defense is directed to adhere to the definition of Program, Project and Activity, and to follow the guidance for Congressional Special Interest Items, Reprogrammings, Reprogramming Reporting Requirements, and Funding Increases, as specified in the Explanatory Statement, Division A, Department of Defense Appropriations Act Fiscal Year 2010, Public Law 111–118.

CLASSIFIED ANNEX

A classified annex accompanying this Act will be forwarded under separate cover.

(Rescissions)

Language is included that rescinds $1,213,536,000 from the following programs:

2009 Appropriations:	
Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army:	
Future Combat Systems	$86,300,000
Other Procurement, Army:	
Armored Security Vehicles	55,000,000
Force XXII Battle Command Brigade and Below	30,600,000
Semi-trailers, Flatbed	62,000,000
Aircraft Procurement, Navy:	
KC–130J	12,000,000
F/A–18E/F	14,100,000
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force:	
Global Hawk excess funds	49,000,000
C–130 AMP	31,900,000
HC/MC updated pricing	36,000,000
2010 Appropriations:	
Aircraft Procurement, Army:	
Tactical SIGINT Payload	14,000,000
Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army:	
Future Combat Systems spin-outs	19,600,000
Improved Recovery Vehicle	8,700,000
MK–19 Grenade Machine Gun Modifications	7,700,000
Missile Procurement, Army:	
GMLRS	9,171,000
Aircraft Procurement, Navy:	
F–35 STOVL AP	100,000,000
EA–18G MYP savings	89,120,000
F/A–18E/F MYP savings	72,727,000
F–18 Series ECO	17,000,000
E–6 Series	6,000,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps:	
General Purpose Bombs	11,576,000
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy:	
DDG–51 main reduction gear savings	22,000,000
Other Procurement, Navy:	
Minesweeping System Replacement	5,400,000
Aircraft Launch Recovery	3,642,000
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force:	
B–2A	5,900,000
B–52	39,300,000
C–17 Modifications	12,200,000
C–130J updated pricing	7,000,000
C–130 AP updated pricing	15,100,000
HC/MC–130 AP	46,900,000
HC/MC–130 updated pricing	13,200,000
Initial Spares—Joint Stars Re-engining	11,700,000
Other Procurement, Air Force:	
FAB–T	36,600,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army:	
Aircraft Avionics—JTRS AMF	10,200,000
HFDS	15,000,000
Future Combat System—Class IV UAV Program of Record	12,000,000
TUAV–TSP	16,300,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force:	
B–2	90,000,000
Classified Program	10,000,000
Alternative Fuels	10,000,000
Small Diameter Bomb	22,000,000
Engine CIP	15,000,000
JSTARS	14,600,000
RQ–4 UAV	18,000,000
C–5 Airlift Squadrons	19,000,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide:	
BMD Hercules	10,000,000

For the Department of Defense base budget, funds are to be available for fiscal year 2011, as follows:

M–1	Budget request	Recommendation
MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY		
BA–1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS		
BASIC PAY	6,392,861	6,392,861
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	2,088,308	2,088,308
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	1,854,718	1,854,718
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	255,925	255,925
INCENTIVE PAYS	97,698	97,698
SPECIAL PAYS	300,939	300,939
ALLOWANCES	198,601	198,601
SEPARATION PAY	61,798	61,798
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	487,469	487,469
TOTAL, BA–1	11,738,317	11,738,317
BA–2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
BASIC PAY	13,682,488	13,682,488
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	4,470,859	4,470,859
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	4,395,850	4,395,850
INCENTIVE PAYS	102,851	102,851
SPECIAL PAYS	1,269,047	1,129,047
Enlistment Bonuses—Excess to Requirement		−40,000
Re-enlistment Bonuses—Excess to Requirement		−100,000
ALLOWANCES	806,471	806,471
SEPARATION PAY	255,127	255,127
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	1,046,710	1,046,710
TOTAL, BA–2	26,029,403	25,889,403
BA–3: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CADETS		
ACADEMY CADETS	74,773	74,773
TOTAL, BA–3	74,773	74,773
BA–4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	1,313,309	1,313,309
SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	817,691	817,691
FAMILY SUBSISTENCE SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOWANCE	748	748
TOTAL, BA–4	2,131,748	2,131,748

M–1	Budget request	Recommendation
BA–5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL		
ACCESSION TRAVEL	202,699	202,699
TRAINING TRAVEL	142,749	142,749
OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	494,937	494,937
ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	674,831	674,831
SEPARATION TRAVEL	198,439	198,439
TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS	12,137	12,137
NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE	12,639	12,639
TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE	38,931	38,931
TOTAL, BA–5	1,777,362	1,777,362
BA–6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS		
APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS	2,233	2,233
INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	648	648
DEATH GRATUITIES	45,500	45,500
UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	188,778	188,778
EDUCATION BENEFITS	30,879	30,879
ADOPTION EXPENSES	610	610
TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDY	8,007	8,007
PARTIAL DISLOCATION ALLOWANCE	338	338
RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	138,731	138,731
JUNIOR ROTC	50,201	50,201
TOTAL, BA–6	465,925	465,925
LESS REIMBURSABLES	−245,251	−245,251
UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS	0	−789,624
Undistributed Transfer to Title IX		−789,624
TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY	41,972,277	41,042,653
MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY		
BA–1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS		
BASIC PAY	3,680,703	3,680,703
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	1,202,462	1,202,462
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	1,263,675	1,263,675
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	143,344	143,344
INCENTIVE PAYS	155,148	155,148
SPECIAL PAYS	355,821	355,821
ALLOWANCES	104,291	104,291
SEPARATION PAY	25,353	25,353
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	278,666	278,666
TOTAL, BA–1	7,209,463	7,209,463
BA–2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
BASIC PAY	8,257,803	8,257,803
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	2,700,204	2,700,204
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	3,682,915	3,682,915
INCENTIVE PAYS	100,499	100,499
SPECIAL PAYS	839,787	814,787
Re-enlistment Bonuses—Excess to Requirement		−5,000
Enlistment Bonuses—Excess to Requirement		−20,000
ALLOWANCES	498,621	498,621
SEPARATION PAY	127,343	127,343
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	631,722	631,722
TOTAL, BA–2	16,838,894	16,813,894
BA–3: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF MIDSHIPMEN		
MIDSHIPMEN	74,950	74,950
TOTAL, BA–3	74,950	74,950
BA–4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	685,085	685,085
SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	419,333	419,333
FAMILY SUBSISTENCE SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOWANCE	12	12
TOTAL, BA–4	1,104,430	1,104,430
BA–5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL		
ACCESSION TRAVEL	76,220	76,220
TRAINING TRAVEL	71,814	71,814
OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	219,685	219,685
ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	354,275	354,275
SEPARATION TRAVEL	103,806	103,806
TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS	39,368	39,368
NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE	5,760	5,760
TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE	6,386	6,386
OTHER	6,406	6,406
TOTAL, BA–5	883,720	883,720
BA–6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS		
APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS	261	261
INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	1,427	1,427
DEATH GRATUITIES	17,700	17,700
UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	88,350	88,350
EDUCATION BENEFITS	21,515	21,515
ADOPTION EXPENSES	271	271
TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDY	8,030	8,030
PARTIAL DISLOCATION ALLOWANCE	190	190
RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	27,345	27,345
JUNIOR R.O.T.C	14,093	14,093
TOTAL, BA–6	179,182	179,182
LESS REIMBURSABLES	−339,690	−339,690
UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT	0	−13,500
Unobligated/Unexpended Balances		−13,500
TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY	25,950,949	25,912,449
MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS		
BA–1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS		
BASIC PAY	1,433,200	1,433,200
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	465,072	465,072
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	462,438	462,438
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	59,613	59,613
INCENTIVE PAYS	50,011	50,011
SPECIAL PAYS	27,921	27,921
ALLOWANCES	34,404	34,404
SEPARATION PAY	13,299	13,299
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	109,014	109,014
TOTAL, BA–1	2,654,972	2,654,972
BA–2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
BASIC PAY	4,910,560	4,910,560
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	1,591,322	1,591,322
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	1,660,161	1,660,161
INCENTIVE PAYS	9,158	9,158
SPECIAL PAYS	288,654	288,654
ALLOWANCES	278,060	278,060

M–1		Budget request	Recommendation
	SEPARATION PAY	65,101	65,101
	SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	372,411	372,411
	TOTAL, BA–2	9,175,427	9,175,427
	BA–4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	489,789	489,789
	SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	324,565	324,565
	FAMILY SUBSISTENCE SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOWANCE	750	750
	TOTAL, BA–4	815,104	815,104
	BA–5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL		
	ACCESSION TRAVEL	79,378	79,378
	TRAINING TRAVEL	10,079	10,079
	OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	239,442	239,442
	ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	115,330	115,330
	SEPARATION TRAVEL	55,528	55,528
	TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS	742	742
	NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE	6,305	6,305
	TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE	13,818	13,818
	OTHER	2,683	2,683
	TOTAL, BA–5	523,305	523,305
	BA–6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS		
	APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS	1,823	1,823
	INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	19	19
	DEATH GRATUITIES	17,200	17,200
	UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	69,359	69,359
	EDUCATION BENEFITS	4,249	4,249
	ADOPTION EXPENSES	159	159
	TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDY	2,853	2,853
	PARTIAL DISLOCATION ALLOWANCE	278	278
	JUNIOR R.O.T.C	5,573	5,573
	TOTAL, BA–6	101,513	101,513
	LESS REIMBURSABLES	−20,160	−20,160
	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT	0	−40,000
	Unobligated/Unexpended Balances		−40,000
	TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS	13,250,161	13,210,161
	MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE		
	BA–1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS		
	BASIC PAY	4,687,593	4,687,593
	RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	1,522,644	1,522,644
	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	1,347,403	1,347,403
	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	182,253	182,253
	INCENTIVE PAYS	239,121	239,121
	SPECIAL PAYS	322,642	322,642
	ALLOWANCES	128,157	128,157
	SEPARATION PAY	64,974	64,974
	SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	355,711	355,711
	TOTAL, BA–1	8,850,498	8,850,498
	BA–2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
	BASIC PAY	8,540,083	8,540,083
	RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	2,781,402	2,781,402
	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	3,038,904	3,038,904
	INCENTIVE PAYS	36,980	36,980
	SPECIAL PAYS	396,103	380,103
	Re-enlistment Bonuses—Excess to Requirement		−16,000
	ALLOWANCES	570,857	570,857
	SEPARATION PAY	124,411	124,411
	SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	653,317	653,317
	TOTAL, BA–2	16,142,057	16,126,057
	BA–3: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CADETS		
	ACADEMY CADETS	75,383	75,383
	TOTAL, BA–3	75,383	75,383
	BA–4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	872,055	872,055
	SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	169,924	169,924
	FAMILY SUBSISTENCE SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOWANCE	37	37
	TOTAL, BA–4	1,042,016	1,042,016
	BA–5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION		
	ACCESSION TRAVEL	87,377	87,377
	TRAINING TRAVEL	72,521	72,521
	OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	296,604	296,604
	ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	505,198	505,198
	SEPARATION TRAVEL	176,549	176,549
	TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS	23,561	23,561
	NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE	40,772	40,772
	TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE	28,936	28,936
	TOTAL, BA–5	1,231,518	1,231,518
	BA–6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS		
	APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS	131	131
	INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	2,179	2,179
	DEATH GRATUITIES	19,900	19,900
	UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	49,143	49,143
	SURVIVOR BENEFITS	1,760	1,760
	EDUCATION BENEFITS	484	484
	ADOPTION EXPENSES	395	395
	TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDY	6,903	6,903
	PARTIAL DISLOCATION ALLOWANCE	1,578	1,578
	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	45,571	45,571
	JUNIOR ROTC	16,185	16,185
	TOTAL, BA–6	144,229	144,229
	LESS REIMBURSABLES	−363,946	−363,946
	TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	27,121,755	27,105,755
	RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY		
	BA–1: RESERVE COMPONENT TRAINING AND SUPPORT		
	PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS and DRILLS 24/48)	1,249,133	1,249,133
	PAY GROUP B TRAINING (BACKFILL FOR ACTIVE DUTY)	44,460	36,460
	Projected Underexecution		−8,000
	PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS)	268,215	268,215
	PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS)	8,830	8,830
	MOBILIZATION TRAINING	21,460	10,460
	Projected Underexecution		−11,000
	SCHOOL TRAINING	177,121	177,121
	SPECIAL TRAINING	293,439	283,439
	Excessive Growth		−10,000

M–1		Budget request	Recommendation
.....	ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	2,129,646	2,129,646
.....	EDUCATION BENEFITS	57,633	57,633
.....	HEALTH PROFESSION SCHOLARSHIP	66,940	66,940
.....	OTHER PROGRAMS	80,288	80,288
.....	TOTAL, BA–1	4,397,165	4,368,165
.....	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT	0	−35,000
.....	Unobligated/Unexpended Balances		−35,000
.....	TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY	4,397,165	4,333,165
	RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY		
.....	BA–1: RESERVE COMPONENT TRAINING AND SUPPORT		
.....	PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS and DRILLS 24/48)	626,657	626,657
.....	PAY GROUP B TRAINING (BACKFILL FOR ACTIVE DUTY)	9,070	9,070
.....	PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS)	45,603	45,603
.....	MOBILIZATION TRAINING	8,434	8,434
.....	SCHOOL TRAINING	45,930	45,930
.....	SPECIAL TRAINING	89,647	89,647
.....	ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	1,061,128	1,061,128
.....	EDUCATION BENEFITS	3,780	3,780
.....	HEALTH PROFESSION SCHOLARSHIP	53,942	53,942
.....	TOTAL, BA–1	1,944,191	1,944,191
.....	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT	0	−4,000
.....	Unobligated/Unexpended Balances		−4,000
.....	TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY	1,944,191	1,940,191
	RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS		
.....	BA–1: RESERVE COMPONENT TRAINING AND SUPPORT		
.....	PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS and DRILLS 24/48)	196,974	196,974
.....	PAY GROUP B TRAINING (BACKFILL FOR ACTIVE DUTY)	36,116	36,116
.....	PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS)	96,138	96,138
.....	MOBILIZATION TRAINING	3,724	3,724
.....	SCHOOL TRAINING	16,810	16,810
.....	SPECIAL TRAINING	27,688	27,688
.....	ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	216,537	216,537
.....	PLATOON LEADER CLASS	12,256	12,256
.....	EDUCATION BENEFITS	11,198	11,198
.....	TOTAL, BA–1	617,441	617,441
.....	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS	0	−5,250
.....	Unobligated/Unexpended Balances		−1,250
.....	MIP Marine Corps Reserve Intelligence Program		−4,000
.....	TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS	617,441	612,191
	RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE		
.....	BA–1: RESERVE COMPONENT TRAINING AND SUPPORT		
.....	PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS and DRILLS 24/48)	670,341	670,341
.....	PAY GROUP B TRAINING (BACKFILL FOR ACTIVE DUTY)	101,951	101,951
.....	PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS)	54,850	54,850
.....	PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS)	50	50
.....	MOBILIZATION TRAINING	447	447
.....	SCHOOL TRAINING	163,272	163,272
.....	SPECIAL TRAINING	243,233	243,233
.....	ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	378,772	378,772
.....	EDUCATION BENEFITS	18,295	18,295
.....	HEALTH PROFESSION SCHOLARSHIP	51,331	51,331
.....	OTHER PROGRAMS (ADMINISTRATION and SUPPORT)	4,255	4,255
.....	TOTAL, BA–1	1,686,797	1,686,797
.....	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS	0	−36,000
.....	Unobligated/Unexpended Balances		−15,000
.....	Below Budgeted End Strength		−21,000
.....	TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	1,686,797	1,650,797
	NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY		
.....	BA–1: RESERVE COMPONENT TRAINING AND SUPPORT		
.....	PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS and DRILLS 24/48)	2,010,867	1,980,867
.....	Unjustified Growth		−30,000
.....	PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS)	510,859	510,859
.....	PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS)	71,222	71,222
.....	SCHOOL TRAINING	577,600	577,600
.....	SPECIAL TRAINING	534,954	521,954
.....	Recruiter Mandays—Excess to Requirement		−13,000
.....	ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	3,788,954	3,788,954
.....	EDUCATION BENEFITS	129,840	129,840
.....	TOTAL, BA–1	7,624,296	7,581,296
.....	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS	0	−70,000
.....	Unobligated/Unexpended Balances		−70,000
.....	TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY	7,624,296	7,511,296
	NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE		
.....	BA–1: RESERVE COMPONENT TRAINING AND SUPPORT		
.....	PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS and DRILLS 24/48)	939,636	931,636
.....	Inactive Duty Training—Unjustified Growth		−8,000
.....	PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS)	99,839	99,839
.....	PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS)	298	298
.....	SCHOOL TRAINING	209,944	209,944
.....	SPECIAL TRAINING	131,226	131,226
.....	ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	1,692,112	1,682,112
.....	Bonuses—Unjustified Requirement		−10,000
.....	EDUCATION BENEFITS	30,543	30,543
.....	TOTAL, BA–1	3,103,598	3,085,598
.....	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS	0	−25,500
.....	Unobligated/Unexpended Balances		−17,500
.....	Lower than Budgeted Pay Grade Mix		−8,000
.....	TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	3,103,598	3,060,098
.....	TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL	127,668,630	126,378,756

M–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY		
111	MANEUVER UNITS	1,087,321	1,087,321

M–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
112	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	114,448	113,790
	Deployment Offset		−658
113	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADES	773,540	769,338
	Deployment Offset		−4,202
114	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	794,806	767,727
	Aircraft Lease for Casualty Evacuation Funded in fiscal year 2011 OCO		−18,500
	Sustainment		−8,579
115	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,399,332	1,392,912
	Transfer to Title IX—MRAP Vehicle Sustainment at Combat Training Centers		−6,420
116	AVIATION ASSETS	897,666	867,666
	Deployment Offset		−30,000
121	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,520,995	2,314,041
	Unjustified Increase for Travel		−91,000
	Removal of One-Time fiscal year 2010 Costs		−35,000
	Transfer to Title IX—Body Armor Sustainment		−71,660
	Transfer to Title IX—Rapid Equipping Force Readiness		−9,294
122	LAND FORCES FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	596,117	574,946
	Transfer to Title IX—Fixed Wing Life Cycle Contract Support		−21,171
123	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	890,122	950,122
	UH–60 A to L Conversions		+60,000
131	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	7,563,566	7,281,191
	Transfer from the Defense Health Program for Centralized Management of the Substance Abuse Program		+30,625
	Army Tenant Pentagon Rent Requirements		−33,000
	Reduced Requirement for Collateral Equipment in fiscal year 2011		−50,000
	Transfer to Title IX—Overseas Security Guards		−200,000
	Transfer to Title IX—Senior Leader—Initiative—Comprehensive Soldier Fitness Program		−30,000
132	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	2,500,892	2,500,892
133	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	390,004	390,004
134	COMBATANT COMMANDER'S CORE OPERATIONS	167,758	167,758
138	COMBATANT COMMANDER'S DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	464,851	464,851
	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	20,161,418	19,642,559
211	STRATEGIC MOBILITY	333,266	333,266
212	ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	102,240	102,240
213	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	5,736	5,736
	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	441,242	441,242
311	OFFICER ACQUISITION	129,902	129,902
312	RECRUIT TRAINING	74,705	74,705
313	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	63,223	63,223
314	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS	479,343	479,343
321	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	1,082,517	1,027,334
	Unjustified Growth in Supply and Equipment Purchases		−40,000
	Transfer to Title IX–Survivability and Maneuverability Training		−15,183
322	FLIGHT TRAINING	1,046,124	1,032,124
	Budget Justification Does not Match Summary of Price and Program Changes		−14,000
323	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	163,607	163,607
324	TRAINING SUPPORT	695,200	695,200
331	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	544,014	524,014
	Budget Justification Does not Match Summary of Price and Program Changes		−20,000
332	EXAMINING	153,091	153,091
333	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	241,170	241,170
334	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	220,771	220,771
335	JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS	175,347	183,347
	Program Increase–Junior ROTC		+8,000
	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3	5,069,014	4,987,831
411	SECURITY PROGRAMS	1,030,355	1,030,355
421	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	587,952	557,826
	First Destination Transportation Cost of New Equipment is Financed in the Cost of Equipment		−30,126
422	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	669,853	669,853
423	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	503,876	503,876
424	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	435,020	435,020
431	ADMINISTRATION	912,355	902,355
	Unjustified Growth for Headquarters Accounts		−10,000
432	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	1,528,371	1,528,371
433	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	368,480	328,480
	Unsupported Request for 712 Temporary Hires		−40,000
434	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	261,829	261,829
435	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	1,145,902	1,149,822
	Capitol 4th		+3,920
436	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	205,967	205,967
437	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	168,664	168,664
441	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS	462,488	476,888
	Outfitting of NATO SOF Headquarters Building		+14,400
442	MISCELLANEOUS SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	19,179	16,179
	Information Operations		−3,000
	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	8,300,291	8,235,485
	FIVE PERCENT COST SAVINGS FOR INVESTMENT IN ENERGY AND UTILITIES PROJECTS THROUGH THE AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT		−1,000
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY	33,971,965	33,306,117
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY		
1A1A	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	4,429,832	4,429,832
1A2A	FLEET AIR TRAINING	81,345	1,605,720
	Transfer of Fleet Air Training funding from SAG 3B2K		+958,200
	Unjustified Administrative Overhead Cost Growth		−4,225
	Transfer of Chief of Naval Air Training from SAG 3B2K		+570,400
1A3A	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA AND ENGINEERING SERVICES	38,932	38,932
1A4A	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	100,485	100,485
1A4N	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	355,520	355,520
1A5A	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,221,410	1,221,410
1A6A	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	27,448	27,448
1B1B	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	3,696,913	3,666,913
	Unjustified Growth in Per Diem Days		−30,000
1B2B	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT AND TRAINING	728,983	728,983
1B4B	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	4,761,670	4,761,670
1B5B	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,344,844	1,338,844
	Transfer to RDTE, DW per Memorandum of Agreement		−1,500
	NAVSEA Process Requirements and Improvement Office Budget Realignment and Consolidation Justified as Program Growth		−4,500
1C1C	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	615,069	550,069
	Overstatement of DISA Pricing Adjustment		−65,000
1C2C	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	89,340	89,340
1C3C	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	177,397	177,397
1C4C	WARFARE TACTICS	416,068	416,068
1C5C	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	316,525	316,525
1C6C	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	1,083,618	870,817
	Unjustified Growth for Naval Expeditionary Combat Command		−20,000
	Transfer to Title IX—Naval Expeditionary Combat Command Increases		−192,801
1C7C	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	165,985	165,985
1C8C	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,836	2,836
1CCH	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	208,250	208,250
1CCM	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	274,071	274,071
1D1D	CRUISE MISSILE	130,219	130,219

M–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
1D2D	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	1,138,418	1,138,418
1D3D	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	89,184	89,184
1D4D	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	459,561	459,561
1D7D	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	366,751	361,751
.....	Civilian Personnel Over-Pricing	.....	−5,000
BSIT	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	820,507	1,031,207
.....	Requested Transfer from OP,N line 147 for NGEN Funding	.....	+217,700
.....	Overstatement of DISA Pricing Adjustment	.....	−7,000
BSM1	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,900,386	1,900,386
BSS1	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,502,857	4,452,857
.....	Transfer to Title IX—Regional/Emergency Operations Center	.....	−50,000
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	29,544,424	30,910,698
2A1F	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	424,047	424,047
2B1G	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	7,593	7,593
2B2G	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	177,482	180,682
.....	Program Increase–Ship Disposal Program	.....	+3,200
2C1H	FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM	70,990	70,990
2C2H	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	2,707	2,707
2C3H	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	23,845	23,845
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	706,664	709,864
3A1J	OFFICER ACQUISITION	141,057	141,057
3A2J	RECRUIT TRAINING	10,853	10,853
3A3J	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	143,504	143,504
3B1K	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	533,004	530,004
.....	Transfer to Title IX—NAVSEA VSSS/EOD Training	.....	−3,000
3B2K	FLIGHT TRAINING	1,538,171	9,571
.....	Transfer of Fleet Air Training funding to SAG 1A2A	.....	−958,200
.....	Transfer of Chief of Naval Air Training to SAG 1A2A	.....	−570,400
3B3K	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	162,844	162,844
3B4K	TRAINING SUPPORT	171,153	171,153
3C1L	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	261,287	261,922
.....	Program Increase–Naval Sea Cadet Corps	.....	+635
3C3L	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	145,560	145,560
3C4L	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	109,865	109,865
3C5L	JUNIOR ROTC	50,369	53,369
.....	Program Increase–Junior ROTC	.....	+3,000
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3	3,267,667	1,739,702
4A1M	ADMINISTRATION	829,010	829,010
4A2M	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	7,632	7,632
4A3M	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	118,838	111,838
.....	Overstated Requirement for Other Intragovernmental Purchases	.....	−7,000
4A4M	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	194,775	194,775
4A5M	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	282,580	282,580
4A6M	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	503,067	496,089
.....	Nuclear Command, Control and Communications Systems Budget Realignment and Consolidation Justified as Program Growth	.....	−6,978
4B1N	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	230,294	230,294
4B2N	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	259,990	259,990
4B3N	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	868,069	856,069
.....	Civilian Personnel Over-Pricing	.....	−12,000
4B5N	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	55,217	55,217
4B6N	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	19,053	19,053
4B7N	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	77,702	77,702
4C1P	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	549,484	546,484
.....	Civilian Personnel Over-Pricing	.....	−3,000
4D1Q	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	5,567	5,567
999	OTHER PROGRAMS	614,275	607,475
.....	Classified Adjustment	.....	−6,800
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	4,615,553	4,579,775
.....	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION DUE TO HISTORIC UNDEREXECUTION	.....	−127,200
.....	FIVE PERCENT COST SAVINGS FOR INVESTMENT IN ENERGY AND UTILITIES PROJECTS THROUGH THE AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT	.....	−3,600
.....	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY	38,134,308	37,809,239
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS		
1A1A	OPERATIONAL FORCES	745,678	745,678
1A2A	FIELD LOGISTICS	658,616	658,616
1A3A	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	78,891	78,891
1B1B	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	72,344	72,344
BSM1	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	594,904	594,904
BSS1	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	2,206,137	2,198,437
.....	Collateral Equipment Decrease in fiscal year 2011 not Properly Accounted for in Budget Documentation	.....	−7,700
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	4,356,570	4,348,870
3A1C	RECRUIT TRAINING	16,096	16,096
3A2C	OFFICER ACQUISITION	420	420
3B1D	SPECIALIZED SKILLS TRAINING	91,197	91,197
3B3D	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	32,379	32,379
3B4D	TRAINING SUPPORT	319,742	319,742
3C1F	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	233,663	233,663
3C2F	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	61,980	61,980
3C3F	JUNIOR ROTC	19,497	19,497
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3	774,974	774,974
4A3G	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	29,569	29,569
4A4G	ADMINISTRATION	341,657	335,657
.....	Administrative Efficiencies	.....	−6,000
4B3N	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	87,570	87,570
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	458,796	452,796
.....	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION DUE TO HISTORIC UNDEREXECUTION	.....	−34,400
.....	FIVE PERCENT COST SAVINGS FOR INVESTMENT IN ENERGY AND UTILITIES PROJECTS THROUGH THE AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT	.....	−2,500
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	5,590,340	5,539,740
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE		
011A	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	4,261,115	4,218,222
.....	Unjustified Growth for Programming/ Execution	.....	−34,408
.....	Unsupported Request for Civilian Personnel	.....	−8,485
011C	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	2,995,278	2,933,353
.....	Unjustified Growth for Programming/ Execution	.....	−61,925
011D	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING	1,573,602	1,508,352
.....	Unjustified Growth for Programming/ Execution	.....	−13,598
.....	Transfer of Range Maintenance funding to SAG 011R	.....	−33,652
.....	Removal of One-Time fiscal year 2010 Cost for F–35A Beddown Costs	.....	−18,000
011M	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	2,189,481	2,176,793
.....	Program Increase–Warner Robins Air Logistics Center Aircraft Depot Maintenance	.....	+4,000
.....	Air Force Requested Transfer to OM,ANG for C–130s	.....	−10,879
.....	Air Force Requested Transfer to OM,AFR for C–130s	.....	−5,809
011R	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,556,234	1,664,886
.....	Transfer of Range Maintenance from SAG 011D	.....	+33,652
.....	Adjustments to Meet Life, Health, Safety and ADA Compliance Standards	.....	+75,000
011Z	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	3,088,003	2,937,621

M–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
.....	Unjustified Growth for Programming/ Execution	.....	−91,675
.....	Unsupported Request for Civilian Personnel	.....	−58,707
012A	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	1,511,243	1,450,927
.....	Unsupported Request for Civilian Personnel	.....	−16,013
.....	Unjustified Growth for Programming/ Execution	.....	−44,303
012C	OTHER COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT PROGRAMS	1,035,291	1,020,300
.....	Unjustified Growth for Programming/Execution	.....	−12,268
.....	Unsupported Request for Civilian Personnel	.....	−2,723
012F	TACTICAL INTELLIGENCE AND SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	595,028	595,028
013A	LAUNCH FACILITIES	342,355	342,355
013C	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	811,022	811,022
015A	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	797,754	791,754
.....	Information Operations	.....	−6,000
015B	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	233,021	225,865
.....	Unsupported Request for Civilian Personnel	.....	−7,156
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	20,989,427	20,676,478
021A	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	2,975,663	2,975,663
021D	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	158,647	158,647
021M	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	140,286	140,286
021R	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	348,231	348,231
021Z	BASE SUPPORT	683,286	635,231
.....	Unsupported Request for Civilian Personnel	.....	−45,577
.....	Unjustified Growth for Programming/ Execution	.....	−2,478
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	4,306,113	4,258,058
031A	OFFICER ACQUISITION	114,403	114,403
031B	RECRUIT TRAINING	28,195	28,195
031D	RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	90,453	90,453
031R	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	411,570	400,652
.....	Unsupported Request for Civilian Personnel	.....	−10,918
031Z	BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMIES ONLY)	902,323	845,576
.....	Unjustified Growth for Programming/ Execution	.....	−16,216
.....	Unsupported Request for Civilian Personnel	.....	−40,531
032A	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	510,065	470,584
.....	Unsupported Request for Civilian Personnel	.....	−11,481
.....	Growth in Overhead Expenses not Justified by Increases to Training Metrics	.....	−28,000
032B	FLIGHT TRAINING	1,012,816	1,012,816
032C	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	221,553	221,553
032D	TRAINING SUPPORT	126,784	123,260
.....	Unsupported Request for Civilian Personnel	.....	−3,524
032M	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	619	619
033A	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	150,222	143,635
.....	Unsupported Request for Civilian Personnel	.....	−1,487
.....	Air Force Recruiting Information Support System Air Force Requested Transfer to RDTE,AF	.....	−5,100
033B	EXAMINING	409	409
033C	OFF DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	172,643	172,643
033D	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	208,872	208,872
033E	JUNIOR ROTC	77,692	81,692
.....	Program Increase Junior ROTC	.....	+4,000
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3	4,028,619	3,915,362
041A	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	1,110,471	1,082,427
.....	Unsupported Request for Civilian Personnel	.....	−28,044
041B	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	949,018	937,913
.....	Unjustified Growth for Programming/ Execution	.....	−5,866
.....	Unsupported Request for Civilian Personnel	.....	−5,239
041M	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	7,365	7,365
041R	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	368,349	367,651
.....	Unsupported Request for Civilian Personnel	.....	−698
041Z	BASE SUPPORT	1,363,230	1,292,621
.....	Unsupported Request for Civilian Personnel	.....	−30,609
.....	Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Fund Pricing	.....	−40,000
042A	ADMINISTRATION	657,268	657,268
042B	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	693,379	672,562
.....	Unjustified Growth for Programming/ Execution	.....	−20,817
042G	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	1,152,877	1,138,670
.....	Unsupported Request for Civilian Personnel	.....	−22,207
.....	Analytical Support for the Executive Agent for Space—Transfer from RDTE,AF line 216	.....	+8,000
042I	CIVIL AIR PATROL CORPORATION	22,848	27,048
.....	Civil Air Patrol Program Increase	.....	+4,200
043A	SECURITY PROGRAMS	1,159,342	1,141,160
.....	Unsupported Request for Civilian Personnel	.....	−18,182
044A	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	36,206	36,206
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	7,520,353	7,360,891
.....	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION DUE TO HISTORIC UNDEREXECUTION	.....	−134,300
.....	FIVE PERCENT COST SAVINGS FOR INVESTMENT IN ENERGY AND UTILITIES PROJECTS THROUGH THE AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT	.....	−13,500
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	36,844,512	36,062,989
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE		
.....	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	420,940	420,940
.....	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	3,944,330	3,930,330
.....	Non-Standard Aviation Platforms Sustainment and Logistical Support	.....	−5,000
.....	Removal of One-Time fiscal year 2010 Congressional Increases	.....	−9,000
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	4,365,270	4,351,270
.....	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	145,896	145,896
.....	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY	97,633	97,633
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3	243,529	243,529
.....	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	156,043	164,043
.....	STARBASE Youth Program	.....	+8,000
.....	BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY	143,441	143,441
.....	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	486,143	482,643
.....	Removal of One-Time fiscal year 2010 Cost for Renewing Three Year License for Software	.....	−3,500
.....	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	1,593	1,593
.....	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	1,384,450	1,374,450
.....	Multinational Information Sharing Programs	.....	−10,000
.....	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	42,404	42,404
.....	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	448,043	396,395
.....	Facilities Sustainment	.....	−58,848
.....	Procurement Technical Assistance Program	.....	+7,200
.....	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	255,878	255,878
.....	DEFENSE POW /MISSING PERSONS OFFICE	24,155	24,155
.....	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY AGENCY	37,624	37,624
.....	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	463,522	445,682
.....	Core Operational Support Activities—unnecessary increase	.....	−17,840
.....	DEFENSE DEPENDENTS EDUCATION	2,514,537	2,679,537
.....	Military Spouse Career Advancement Accounts	.....	+165,000
.....	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	824,153	794,353
.....	Joint Advertising, Market Research and Studies	.....	−29,800
.....	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,112,849	1,107,849
.....	Overstatement of NSPS to GS Conversion	.....	−5,000
.....	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	683,853	539,369

M–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
.....	Global Train and Equip (1206)	.....	−139,507
.....	Stability Operations Fellowship Program—not authorized	.....	−4,977
.....	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	518,743	518,743
.....	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	50,811	50,811
.....	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	2,245,300	2,232,986
.....	Battlefield Information Collection and Exploitation System	.....	−15,000
.....	Combatant Commander's Exercise Engagement and Training Transformation (CE2T2)	.....	−26,500
.....	Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative	.....	+60,186
.....	Overstatement of Civilian Personnel Pay Requirements	.....	−24,500
.....	AT&L–Integrated Acquisition Environment Internal Realignment not Properly Accounted for in Budget Documentation	.....	−6,500
.....	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	604,130	594,330
.....	Overstatement of Civilian Personnel Pay Requirements	.....	−9,800
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	11,997,672	11,886,286
.....	OTHER PROGRAMS	13,977,425	13,685,725
.....	Classified Adjustments	.....	−291,700
.....	IMPACT AID	.....	40,000
.....	IMPACT AID FOR CHILDREN WITH SEVERE DISABILITIES	.....	4,000
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	30,583,896	30,210,810
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE		
111	MANEUVER UNITS	1,282	1,282
112	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	12,413	12,413
113	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADES	460,814	460,814
114	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	168,020	168,020
115	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	555,944	555,944
116	AVIATION ASSETS	70,378	70,378
121	FORCES READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	391,326	381,326
	Decrease Requested Growth for Travel	.....	−10,000
122	LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS	108,093	108,093
123	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	136,854	136,854
131	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	577,146	567,146
	Unjustified Increase in Motor Pool Operations Costs	.....	−10,000
132	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	234,486	234,486
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	2,716,756	2,696,756
421	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	12,717	12,717
431	ADMINISTRATION	74,685	74,685
432	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	3,797	3,797
433	PERSONNEL/FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION	9,245	9,245
434	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	61,877	61,877
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	162,321	162,321
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION DUE TO HISTORIC UNDEREXECUTION	.....	−18,650
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	2,879,077	2,840,427
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE		
1A1A	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	599,649	599,649
1A3A	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	13,209	13,209
1A4A	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	2,668	2,668
1A5A	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	140,377	140,377
1A6A	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	309	309
1B1B	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	65,757	62,757
.....	Mismatch of OPTEMPO and Steaming Day Performance Data	.....	−3,000
1B2B	SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	587	587
1B4B	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	91,054	91,054
1C1C	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	15,882	15,882
1C6C	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	140,186	140,186
1D4D	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	5,492	5,492
BSIT	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	56,046	56,046
BSMR	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	81,407	81,407
BSSR	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	131,988	131,988
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	1,344,611	1,341,611
4A1M	ADMINISTRATION	3,276	3,276
4A4M	MILITARY MANPOWER & PERSONNEL	13,698	13,698
4A6M	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	2,628	2,628
4B3N	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	3,551	3,551
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	23,153	23,153
.....	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION DUE TO HISTORIC UNDEREXECUTION	.....	−20,500
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	1,367,764	1,344,264
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE		
1A1A	OPERATING FORCES	104,566	104,566
1A3A	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	16,392	16,392
BSM1	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	38,762	38,762
BSS1	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	99,924	92,424
.....	Eliminate Growth in Administrative Costs	.....	−7,500
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	259,644	252,144
BSM1	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	835	835
BSS1	ADMINISTRATION	15,871	15,871
3A1C	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	8,884	8,884
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	25,590	25,590
.....	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION DUE TO HISTORIC UNDEREXECUTION	.....	−2,250
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	285,234	275,484
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE		
011A	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	2,275,407	2,276,450
.....	Air Force Requested Transfer to OM,ANG for C–130s	.....	−2,017
.....	Air Force Requested Transfer from OM,AF for C–130s	.....	+3,060
011G	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	111,742	111,742
011M	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	415,687	418,436
.....	Air Force Requested Transfer from OM,AF for C–130s	.....	+2,749
011R	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	88,822	88,822
011Z	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	277,985	277,985
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	3,169,643	3,173,435
042A	ADMINISTRATION	80,526	80,526
042J	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	24,353	24,353
042K	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	19,716	19,716
042L	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	6,071	6,071
042M	AUDIOVISUAL	726	726
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	131,392	131,392
.....	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION DUE TO HISTORIC UNDEREXECUTION	.....	−13,800
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE	3,301,035	3,291,027
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
111	MANEUVER UNITS	807,193	807,193

M–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
112	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	166,474	166,474
113	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	607,567	607,567
114	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	249,930	249,930
115	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	35,657	35,657
116	AVIATION ASSETS	838,895	854,895
.....	Aircraft Maintenance Program Increase	.....	+16,000
121	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	570,119	544,119
.....	Distance Learning—Transfer from OCO OM,ARNG SAG 135	.....	+9,000
.....	Realignment of Funding for the Organizational Clothing and Equipment Enterprise Environment not Properly Accounted for in Budget Documentation	.....	−35,000
122	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	121,980	121,980
123	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	380,789	380,789
131	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	933,514	853,514
.....	Unjustified Growth for Information Management Systems	.....	−80,000
132	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	621,843	661,843
.....	Army National Guard Program Increase	.....	+40,000
133	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	540,738	549,626
.....	Transfer from Defense Health Program for Psychological Health—State Directors for the National Guard	.....	+8,888
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	5,874,699	5,833,587
421	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	17,771	17,771
431	ADMINISTRATION	183,781	151,463
.....	Pay and Benefits Mismatch Between Op–5 and Op–32	.....	−32,318
432	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	48,188	48,188
433	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	8,020	8,020
434	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	440,245	440,245
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	698,005	665,687
.....	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION DUE TO HISTORIC UNDEREXECUTION	.....	−36,650
.....	FIVE PERCENT COST SAVINGS FOR INVESTMENT IN ENERGY AND UTILITIES PROJECTS THROUGH THE AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT	.....	−8,000
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	6,572,704	6,454,624
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
011F	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	3,519,452	3,525,525
.....	Air Force Requested Transfer from OM,AFR for C–130s	.....	+2,017
.....	Air Force Requested Transfer from OM,AF for C–130s	.....	+4,056
011G	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	762,937	762,937
011M	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	598,779	605,602
.....	Air Force Requested Transfer from OM,AF for C–130s	.....	+6,823
011R	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	315,210	355,210
.....	Air National Guard Program Increase	.....	+40,000
011Z	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	668,176	668,176
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	5,864,554	5,917,450
042A	ADMINISTRATION	41,930	41,930
042J	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	34,659	34,659
.....	SUBTOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	76,589	76,589
.....	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION DUE TO HISTORIC UNDEREXECUTION	.....	−30,200
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	5,941,143	5,963,839
	MISCELLANEOUS		
.....	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER ACCOUNT	5,000	0
.....	Unjustified Request	.....	−5,000
.....	U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES	14,068	14,068
.....	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	444,581	464,581
.....	Program Increase	.....	+20,000
.....	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	304,867	304,867
.....	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	502,653	502,653
.....	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE	10,744	10,744
.....	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FUDS	276,546	316,546
.....	Program Increase	.....	+40,000
.....	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID	108,032	108,032
.....	COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAM	522,512	522,512
.....	ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND	217,561	217,561
.....	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	167,878,542	165,560,124

P–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
3	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) (MIP)	88,483	0
.....	Program Adjustment for Schedule Slip	.....	−88,483
4	MQ–1 UAV	459,310	434,310
.....	Contract Savings	.....	−25,000
5	RQ–11 (RAVEN)	20,152	20,152
6	BCT UNMANNED AERIAL VEH (UAVS) INCR 1	44,206	26,568
.....	Program Reduction	.....	−17,638
8	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)	305,272	305,272
9	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK III	332,681	332,681
10	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK III (AP–CY)	161,150	161,150
11	UH–60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	1,250,566	1,250,566
12	UH–60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) (AP–CY)	100,532	100,532
13	CH–47 HELICOPTER	1,101,293	1,101,293
14	CH–47 HELICOPTER (AP–CY)	57,756	57,756
15	HELICOPTER NEW TRAINING	9,383	0
.....	Unjustified Request	.....	−9,383
17	MQ–1 PAYLOAD—UAS	100,413	80,413
.....	Tactical SIGINT Payload Schedule Adjustment	.....	−20,000
18	MQ–1 WEAPONIZATION—UAS	14,729	14,729
19	GUARDRAIL MODS (MIP)	29,899	25,799
.....	Airborne Precision Geolocation	.....	−4,100
20	MULTI SENSOR AIRBORNE RECON (MIP)	16,981	16,981
21	AH–64 MODS	393,769	393,769
23	CH–47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS	66,207	66,207
25	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS	13,716	13,716
26	AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS	814	814
27	UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS	63,085	80,085
.....	UH–60 A to L conversions	.....	+17,000
28	KIOWA WARRIOR	94,400	42,300
.....	Cockpit and Sensor Upgrade Program Funding Ahead of Need	.....	−52,100
29	AIRBORNE AVIONICS	219,425	207,425
.....	Contract Savings	.....	−12,000
30	GATM ROLLUP	100,862	100,862
31	RQ–7 UAV MODS	505,015	2,515
.....	Funding Ahead of Need for Installation	.....	−5,000
.....	Transfer to Title IX	.....	−497,500
34	SPARE PARTS (AIR)	7,328	9,956
.....	Transfer from OP,A line 195 at Army request	.....	+2,628
35	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	24,478	24,478
36	ASE INFRARED COUNTER MEASURES	174,222	163,722
.....	Excess to Requirement	.....	−10,500

P–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
37	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	4,885	4,885
38	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	76,129	76,129
39	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS	52,423	52,423
40	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	82,844	82,844
41	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	1,567	1,567
42	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET	2,892	2,892
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	5,976,867	5,254,791
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
1	PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY	480,247	613,847
.....	PAC–3 Launchers and Missiles Army UFR	.....	+133,600
2	SURFACE-LAUNCHED AMRAAM SYS SUMMARY	116,732	102,732
.....	Program Reduction	.....	−14,000
4	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	31,881	31,881
5	JAVELIN (AAWS–M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	163,929	163,929
6	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	30,326	24,326
.....	Program Adjustment for Growth in Management and Administration Costs	.....	−6,000
7	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY (AP–CY)	48,355	0
.....	Excess to Requirement	.....	−48,355
8	BCT NON LINE OF SIGHT LAUNCH SYSTEM	350,574	0
.....	Program Termination	.....	−350,574
9	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	291,041	266,041
.....	Program Reduction	.....	−25,000
10	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)	15,886	15,886
11	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM	211,517	204,517
.....	Program Adjustment, Carriers Procured in fiscal year 2010	.....	−7,000
12	PATRIOT MODS	57,170	57,170
13	ITAS/TOW MODS	13,281	13,281
14	MLRS MODS	8,217	8,217
15	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS	39,371	39,371
16	HELLFIRE MODIFICATIONS	10	10
17	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	19,569	19,569
18	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS	3,613	3,613
19	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES)	1,208	1,208
20	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT	4,510	4,510
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	1,887,437	1,570,108
	PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY		
4	STRYKER VEHICLE	299,545	350,945
.....	Transfer from OP,A line 9	.....	+61,300
.....	Adjust Program Management Costs	.....	−9,900
9	STRYKER (MOD)	146,352	85,052
.....	Transfer to OP,A line 4	.....	−61,300
10	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)	31,083	31,083
11	BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD)	215,133	204,133
.....	Program Reduction	.....	−11,000
12	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)	105,277	5,277
.....	Program Adjustment for Schedule Slip	.....	−70,000
.....	Transfer to RDTE,A line 116 for Paladin PIM	.....	−30,000
13	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES)	69,609	69,609
14	ARMORED BREACHER VEHICLE	77,930	77,930
15	M88 FOV MODS	9,157	9,157
16	JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE	44,133	0
.....	Funded Ahead of Need	.....	−44,133
17	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)	230,907	230,907
18	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM	183,000	183,000
19	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV–WTCV)	3,145	3,145
20	HOWITZER, LIGHT, TOWED, 105MM, M119	5,575	0
.....	Funds Excess to Requirement	.....	−5,575
21	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN (7.62MM)	28,179	20,479
.....	Pricing Correction	.....	−7,700
22	MACHINE GUN, CAL .50 M2 ROLL	79,496	0
.....	Transfer to Title IX	.....	−79,496
23	LIGHTWEIGHT .50 CALIBER MACHINE GUN	18,941	18,941
25	MK–19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN (40MM)	4,465	4,465
26	MORTAR SYSTEMS	17,082	17,082
27	M107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE	235	235
28	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM)	16,282	16,282
29	M110 SEMI–AUTOMATIC SNIPER SYSTEM (SASS)	5,159	5,159
30	M4 CARBINE	20,180	20,180
31	SHOTGUN, MODULAR ACCESSORY SYSTEM (MASS)	7,153	7,153
33	HANDGUN	3,371	0
.....	Program Reduction	.....	−3,371
35	MK–19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN MODS	4,286	2,986
.....	Tactical Engagement Simulator Terminated	.....	−1,300
36	M4 CARBINE MODS	14,044	14,044
38	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS	5,922	5,922
39	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS	15,852	15,852
40	M119 MODIFICATIONS	39,810	39,810
41	M16 RIFLE MODS	3,855	3,855
43	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV–WTCV)	6,083	6,083
45	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV–WTCV)	7,869	7,869
46	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	409	409
47	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)	4,042	4,042
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	1,723,561	1,461,086
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		
1	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES	195,406	195,406
2	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES	79,622	79,622
3	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES	5,377	5,377
4	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES	160,712	160,712
6	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES	15,887	15,887
7	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES	95,222	95,222
8	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES	167,632	167,632
9	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	14,340	14,340
10	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	24,036	24,036
11	CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, ALL TYPES	96,335	67,735
.....	APMI Unit Cost Savings	.....	−28,600
12	CTG TANK 105MM: ALL TYPES	7,794	7,794
13	CTG, TANK, 120MM, ALL TYPES	114,798	114,798
14	CTG, ARTY, 75MM: ALL TYPES	7,329	7,329
15	CTG, ARTY, 105MM: ALL TYPES	76,658	76,658
16	CTG, ARTY, 155MM, ALL TYPES	45,752	45,752
17	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982	62,114	30,700
.....	Exceeds Revised Requirement	.....	−31,414
18	MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS), ALL T	29,309	21,909
.....	Decrease to Reduce Backlog in MACS M232 Production	.....	−7,400
19	ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES	25,047	15,047
.....	Program Delay, Precision Guidance Kit	.....	−10,000
20	MINES, ALL TYPES	817	817
21	MINE, CLEARING CHARGE, ALL TYPES	8,000	8,000

P–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
22	ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINE ALTERNATIVES	53,005	8,317
	FRD Slipped to fiscal year 2012		−44,688
23	INTELLIGENT MUNITIONS SYSTEM (IMS), ALL TYPES	10,246	0
	Program Adjustment for Schedule Slip		−10,246
24	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	43,873	43,873
25	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	120,628	120,628
26	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	19,824	19,824
27	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	41,803	41,803
28	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	39,472	39,472
29	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES	11,389	11,389
30	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES	17,499	17,499
31	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES	5,266	5,266
32	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES	5,322	5,322
33	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	9,768	9,768
34	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT	12,721	12,721
35	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)	11,786	11,786
36	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES	100	100
37	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	144,368	144,368
38	LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	9,504	9,504
39	MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES	9,025	9,025
40	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION, ALL	178,367	178,367
41	ARMS INITIATIVE	3,261	3,261
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	1,979,414	1,847,066
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
1	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	25,560	0
	Army Requested Program Adjustment		−25,560
2	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED:	38,713	0
	Funded Ahead of Need		−38,713
5	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	918,195	693,495
	Pricing Adjustment		−224,700
6	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMEN	21,317	21,317
7	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	549,741	549,741
8	PALLETIZED LOAD SYS—EXTENDED SERVICE PGM	100,108	56,208
	Program Adjustment for Schedule Slip		−43,900
9	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)	114,478	114,478
10	MINE PROTECTION VEHICLE FAMILY	230,978	0
	Transfer to Title IX		−230,978
12	TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916	37,519	21,519
	Excess to Need		−16,000
13	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV	173,565	173,565
15	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	349,256	0
	Funded Ahead of Need		−56,300
	Transfer to Title IX		−292,956
17	TOWING DEVICE-FIFTH WHEEL	234	234
18	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS, OPA1	746	746
19	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN	1,875	0
	Slow Execution		−1,875
20	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	3,323	1,323
	Slow Execution		−2,000
21	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER	19,586	19,586
23	JOINT COMBAT IDENTIFICATION MARKING SYSTEM	11,411	11,411
24	WIN–T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK	421,798	391,798
	Program Adjustment, Increment 2 Slow Execution		−20,000
	Program Adjustment, Area Common User System Modernization Slow Execution		−10,000
25	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)	4,690	4,690
26	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS	115,744	115,744
27	SHF TERM	14,198	14,198
28	SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)	662	662
29	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	32,193	32,193
30	SMART–T (SPACE)	10,285	10,285
31	SCAMP (SPACE)	930	930
32	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC—GBS	4,586	4,586
33	MOD OF IN–SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	1,506	1,506
34	MOD–IN–SERVICE PROFILER	938	938
35	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)	20,387	20,387
36	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)	700	700
37	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM	209,568	159,468
	Program Reduction in Small Form Factor-C Radio		−5,000
	Funded Ahead of Need		−45,100
38	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)	5,796	5,796
39	SINCGARS FAMILY	14,504	12,604
	Unjustified Growth		−1,900
40	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS—OPA2	3,860	3,860
41	MULTIPURPOSE INFORMATION OPERATIONS SYSTEMS	9,501	9,501
42	COMMS–ELEC EQUIP FIELDING	5,965	5,965
43	SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT	26,358	6,758
	Army Requested Program Adjustment		−19,600
44	INTELLIGENT MUNITIONS SYSTEM REMOTE CONTROL UNIT	6,603	0
	Funded Ahead of Need		−6,603
45	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM AND ELECTRONICS	5,125	5,125
46	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL)	2,397	2,397
47	RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY	9,983	9,983
48	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)	23,606	23,606
49	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE (MIP)	1,465	1,465
50	TSEC—ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)	25,959	25,959
51	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM—ISSP	63,340	54,858
	Protected Information—Biometrics—Transfer to OP,A line 51x		−8,482
51x	FAMILY OF BIOMETRICS	0	8,482
	Non-MIP Biometrics—Transfer from OP,A line 51		+8,482
52	TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION	137	137
53	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS	28,406	28,406
54	WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)	11,566	11,566
55	INFORMATION SYSTEMS	201,081	201,081
56	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)	6,264	6,264
57	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM	178,242	178,242
58	PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM	10,427	10,427
64	JTT/CIBS–M (MIP)	3,321	3,321
65	PROPHET GROUND (MIP)	71,517	71,517
68	DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (MIP)	441	441
70	DCGS–A (MIP)	137,424	0
	Transfer to Title IX		−137,424
71	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTAGS)	9,279	9,279
72	TROJAN (MIP)	28,345	28,345
73	MOD OF IN–SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP)	7,602	7,602
74	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS)(MIP)	7,416	7,416
75	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MIP)	18,721	18,721
76	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR	32,980	80,080
	Program Adjustment		+47,100
77	WARLOCK	24,127	16,127
	Excess to Need		−8,000
78	BCT UNATTENDED GROUND SENSOR	29,718	14,718
	Program Reduction		−15,000

P–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
79	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURE	1,394	1,394
80	CI MODERNIZATION (MIP)	1,263	1,263
81	FORWARD AREA AIR DEFENSE—GROUND BASED SENSOR	91,467	91,467
82	SENTINEL MODS	30,976	30,976
83	SENSE THROUGH THE WALL (STTW)	24,939	24,939
84	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	70,528	70,528
85	LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYS	255,641	230,641
	Excess to Need		−25,000
86	NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT	248,899	248,899
87	SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF	8,520	8,520
89	COUNTER-ROCKET, ARTILLERY & MORTAR	2,088	2,088
91	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP	6,042	0
	Funded Ahead of Need		−6,042
94	PROFILER	4,408	4,408
95	MOD OF IN–SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)	2,843	2,843
96	FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2)	39,786	39,786
97	JOINT BATTLE COMMAND—PLATFORM (JBCP)	147	147
98	LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER	65,970	65,970
99	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32	815	815
100	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	16,475	16,475
101	COUNTERFIRE RADARS	275,867	0
	Transfer to Title IX		−275,867
102	ENHANCED SENSOR & MONITORING SYSTEM	2,062	2,062
103	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS	53,768	43,768
	Program Reduction		−10,000
104	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY	49,077	49,077
105	BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM	25,866	25,866
106	FAAD C2	42,511	32,511
	Program Reduction		−10,000
107	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS	57,038	57,038
108	KNIGHT FAMILY	120,723	120,723
109	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)	1,710	1,710
110	AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	10,858	10,858
111	TC AIMS II	10,457	10,457
113	TACTICAL INTERNET MANAGER	1,594	1,594
114	NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE	18,492	18,492
115	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	96,162	96,162
116	SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE)	99,819	99,819
117	RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEYING INSTRUMENT SET	15,466	15,466
119	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM	97,858	97,858
120	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION	36,158	36,158
121	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT	203,864	203,864
122	CSS COMMUNICATIONS	39,811	39,811
123	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)	39,360	39,360
124	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (A/V)	663	663
125	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)	6,467	6,467
128	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C–E)	542	542
129	BCT NETWORK	176,543	136,543
	Program Reduction		−40,000
130	PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS	2,489	2,489
131	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE)	9,305	9,305
132	CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION	180,351	180,351
133	SMOKE & OBSCURANT FAMILY: SOF (NON AAO ITEM)	831	831
134	TACTICAL BRIDGING	62,817	62,817
135	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON	105,837	105,837
136	HANDHELD STANDOFF MINEFIELD DETECTION SYS	43,871	43,871
137	GROUND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM	35,002	35,002
138	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIPMENT	54,093	54,093
139	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT	3,655	3,655
141	HEATERS AND ECU'S	20,610	20,610
143	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT	5,416	5,416
146	PERSONNEL RECOVERY SUPPORT SYSTEM (PRSS)	7,813	7,813
147	GROUND SOLDIER SYSTEM	110,524	96,024
	Program Reduction		−14,500
148	MOUNTED SOLDIER SYSTEM	38,872	38,872
149	FORCE PROVIDER	41,539	41,539
150	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT	23,826	23,826
151	CARGO AERIAL DELIVERY AND PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM	69,496	69,496
152	MOBILE INTEGRATED REMAINS COLLECTION SYSTEM	26,532	26,532
153	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (ENGINEER SUPPORT)	31,420	31,420
154	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM AND WATER	175,069	164,369
	Program Adjustment		−10,700
155	WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS	3,597	0
	Funded Ahead of Need		−3,597
156	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL	30,365	30,365
157	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS	159,285	139,985
	Unjustified Growth		−19,300
158	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ)	3,702	3,702
159	GRADER, ROAD MOTORIZED, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)	48,379	48,379
160	SKID STEER LOADER (SSL) FAMILY OF SYSTEM	17,498	17,498
161	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING	12,452	12,452
163	MISSION MODULES–ENGINEERING	62,111	54,111
	Unjustified Growth		−8,000
164	LOADERS	7,205	7,205
165	HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR	8,458	8,458
166	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED	64,032	64,032
167	PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING	10,783	10,783
168	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE) FOS	64,959	60,959
	Unjustified Growth		−4,000
169	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT ESP	11,063	11,063
170	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONSTRUCTION EQUIP)	20,565	17,565
	Unjustified Growth		−3,000
171	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	202,764	202,764
172	HARBORMASTER COMMAND AND CONTROL CENTER (HCCC)	37,683	37,683
173	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)	8,052	8,052
174	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT	113,573	113,573
175	ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH)	29,460	29,460
176	FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS	12,936	12,936
177	ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM	17,352	17,352
178	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT	23,400	23,400
179	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	297,200	322,200
	Training Range Upgrades		+25,000
180	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	64,912	64,912
181	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER	26,120	26,120
182	GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING	4,964	4,964
183	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT	38,778	38,778
184	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)	104,472	104,472
185	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	19,166	18,166
	Funded Ahead of Need		−1,000
186	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	42,229	21,229
	Excess to Need		−21,000
187	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)	56,195	56,195
188	BASE LEVEL COMMERCIAL EQUIPMENT	1,873	1,873
189	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA–3)	103,046	82,046

P–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
.....	Program Adjustment	.....	−21,000
190	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)	2,233	2,233
192	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING	44,483	44,483
193	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS OPA3	13,104	13,104
194	MA8975	3,894	3,894
195	BCT UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE	20,046	20,046
196	BCT TRAINING/LOGISTICS/MANAGEMENT	61,581	31,581
.....	Program Reduction	.....	−30,000
197	INITIAL SPARES–C&E	38,707	36,079
.....	Transfer to AP,A line 34 at Army request	.....	−2,628
.....	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	2,560	2,560
xx	PROCUREMENT INNOVATION	0	15,000
.....	Procurement Innovation	.....	+15,000
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	9,765,808	8,145,665
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
1	EA–18G	1,028,801	971,241
.....	Multi-year Procurement Savings	.....	−49,836
.....	Support Funding Carryover	.....	−7,724
2	EA–18G (AP–CY)	55,081	55,081
3	F/A–18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP)	1,784,894	1,684,086
.....	Multi-year Procurement Savings	.....	−92,746
.....	Support Funding Carryover	.....	−8,062
4	F/A–18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP) (AP–CY)	2,295	2,295
5	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER	1,667,093	1,653,093
.....	Support Funding Carryover	.....	−14,000
6	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	219,895	219,895
7	JSF STOVL	2,289,816	555,716
.....	Support Funding Carryover	.....	−42,500
.....	Delete Two Aircraft	.....	−391,600
	Transfer Eight Aircraft to CTOL Variant	.....	−1,300,000
8	JSF STOVL (AP–CY)	286,326	286,326
9	V–22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	2,121,036	2,121,036
10	V–22 (MEDIUM LIFT) (AP–CY)	81,875	81,875
11	UH–1Y/AH–1Z	738,709	738,709
12	UH–1Y/AH–1Z (AP–CY)	69,360	58,560
.....	Unjustified Cost Growth	.....	−10,800
13	MH–60S (MYP)	478,591	478,591
14	MH–60S (MYP) (AP–CY)	70,080	66,280
.....	Unexecutable EOQ	.....	−3,800
15	MH–60R	897,933	897,933
16	MH–60R (AP–CY)	162,006	129,006
.....	Unexecutable EOQ	.....	−33,000
17	P–8A POSEIDON	1,824,437	1,820,560
.....	Operational Flight Trainer Cost Growth	.....	−2,155
.....	Weapons Tactics Trainer Cost Growth	.....	−1,722
18	P–8A POSEIDON (ADVANCED PROCUREMENT)	166,153	147,653
.....	Funded Ahead of Need	.....	−18,500
19	E–2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP)	819,184	819,184
20	E–2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP) (AP–CY)	118,619	118,619
21	C–40A	.....	74,100
.....	Add One Aircraft	.....	+74,100
22	JPATS	266,065	26,274
.....	Contract Delay	.....	−234,849
.....	Support Funding Carryover	.....	−4,942
26	MQ–8 UAV	47,484	43,984
.....	Support Funding Carryover	.....	−3,500
27	STUASLO UAV	23,912	0
.....	Program Delay	.....	−23,912
29	EA–6 SERIES	14,891	0
.....	Unjustified Request in Avionics and Structural Improvements OSIP	.....	−8,900
.....	ICAP III OSIP Unjustified Request	.....	−5,991
30	AEA SYSTEMS	33,772	29,972
.....	Low Band Transmitter Modification Kit Pricing	.....	−1,400
.....	ECO growth	.....	−2,400
31	AV–8 SERIES	19,386	19,386
32	F–18 SERIES	492,821	443,806
.....	ECP 904 Modification Kit Cost Growth	.....	−2,310
.....	ECP 583R2 Installation Equipment Kit Cost Growth	.....	−3,780
.....	ATFLIR Installation Equipment Kit Cost Growth	.....	−11,745
.....	Mission Planning/Unique Planning Component Growth	.....	−2,400
.....	OSIP 002–07 Excess ECO Funding	.....	−9,000
.....	ECP6279 Radar Modification Kits Ahead of Need	.....	−7,880
.....	OSIP 001–10 Integrated Logistics Support Growth	.....	−2,500
.....	Unjustified Cost Growth	.....	−9,400
33	H–46 SERIES	17,685	17,685
34	AH–1W SERIES	11,011	11,011
35	H–53 SERIES	25,871	25,871
36	SH–60 SERIES	67,779	67,779
37	H–1 SERIES	3,060	3,060
38	EP–3 SERIES	90,323	90,323
39	P–3 SERIES	221,982	186,982
.....	Unjustified Cost Growth	.....	−35,000
40	E–2 SERIES	47,046	67,046
.....	Reliability Enhancements for E–2C	.....	+20,000
41	TRAINER A/C SERIES	23,999	23,999
42	C–2A	16,020	16,020
43	C–130 SERIES	17,839	17,839
44	FEWSG	21,928	16,696
.....	AN/ALQ–167 Modification Kit Cost Growth	.....	−5,232
45	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES	16,092	16,092
46	E–6 SERIES	149,164	121,194
.....	Block 1 Upgrade Training Kit Cost Growth	.....	−5,040
.....	Block 1 Upgrade OSIP Support Funding Growth	.....	−3,000
.....	SLEP Installation Delay	.....	−2,630
.....	Funded Ahead of Need	.....	−17,300
47	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES	43,443	43,443
48	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	14,679	14,679
49	T–45 SERIES	61,515	46,215
.....	Engine Surge OSIP Installation Funding Ahead of Need	.....	−500
.....	Engine Surge OSIP Contract Delay	.....	−2,800
.....	Required Avionics Modernization Program Modification Kit Cost Growth	.....	−3,900
.....	Synthetic Aperture Radar OSIP Contract Delay	.....	−8,100
50	POWER PLANT CHANGES	19,948	19,948
51	JPATS SERIES	1,831	1,831
52	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT MODS	8,084	2,984
.....	Transfer to RDTE,N line 93 for Common Mobile Aircrew Restraint System	.....	−5,100
53	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	21,947	21,947
54	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES	101,120	79,820
.....	CNS/ATM Installation Equipment Contract Savings	.....	−12,400
.....	CNS/ATM Installation Funding Ahead of Need	.....	−1,400
.....	Tactical Moving Map Capability Modifications Funding Ahead of Need	.....	−7,500
56	ID SYSTEMS	20,397	20,397

P–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
57	RQ–7 SERIES	18,121	18,121
58	V–22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY	21,985	21,985
59	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	1,244,673	1,234,084
	JPATS Contract Delay		−10,589
60	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	322,063	322,063
61	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	17,998	17,998
62	WAR CONSUMABLES	25,248	25,248
63	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	7,579	7,579
64	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	45,916	45,916
65	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	1,752	1,752
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	18,508,613	16,170,868
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
1	TRIDENT II MODS	1,106,911	1,106,911
2	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	3,446	3,446
3	TOMAHAWK	300,178	288,278
	Production Engineering Support Growth		−1,900
	Support Funding Carryover		−10,000
4	AMRAAM	155,553	145,553
	Support Funding Carryover		−10,000
5	SIDEWINDER	52,293	52,293
6	JSOW	131,141	129,641
	Support Funding Carryover		−1,500
7	STANDARD MISSILE	295,922	248,222
	Support Funding Carryover		−5,700
	Smooth Production Ramp—SM 6		−42,000
8	RAM	74,976	68,046
	Contract Savings		−1,930
	Program Rebaselined—Milestone C Slip for Block II		−5,000
9	HELLFIRE	43,495	41,995
	Support Funding Carryover		−1,500
10	AERIAL TARGETS	43,988	42,888
	ECM/Emitter Equipment Cost Growth		−1,100
11	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT	3,981	3,981
12	ESSM	48,152	45,515
	Support Funding Carryover		−2,637
13	HARM MODS	53,543	52,191
	Support Funding Carryover		−1,352
14	STANDARD MISSILES MODS	61,896	61,896
15	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	3,281	3,281
16	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON	505,734	505,734
18	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	52,152	52,152
19	ASW TARGETS	10,123	5,197
	Contract Delay		−4,926
20	MK–46 TORPEDO MODS	42,144	42,144
21	MK–48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS	43,559	29,859
	Contract Delay—Funds for 15 kits and NRE		−13,700
22	QUICKSTRIKE MINE	6,090	6,090
23	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	43,766	43,766
24	ASW RANGE SUPPORT	9,557	9,557
25	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	3,494	3,494
26	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	14,316	14,316
27	CIWS MODS	41,408	29,022
	Block 1B Systems Ahead of Need		−12,386
28	COAST GUARD WEAPONS	20,657	13,259
	CIWS Ahead of Need		−5,698
	MK160 Ahead of Need		−1,700
29	GUN MOUNT MODS	43,991	40,791
	Installation Funding Ahead of Need		−3,200
30	LCS MODULE WEAPONS	9,808	0
	NLOS Program Termination		−9,808
31	CRUISER MODERNIZATION WEAPONS	52,426	50,626
	Support Funding Carryover		−1,800
32	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS	23,007	23,007
35	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	58,806	58,806
	TOTAL, WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	3,359,794	3,221,957
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS		
1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	80,028	77,928
	Direct Attack Moving Target Capability Program Cost Growth		−2,100
3	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	38,721	23,171
	MK 66 Rocket Motor (Mod 4) Unit Cost Efficiencies		−6,000
	2.75'' Launcher Unit Cost Efficiencies		−9,550
4	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	21,003	21,003
5	PRACTICE BOMBS	33,666	31,666
	Support Funding Carryover		−2,000
6	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES	53,667	52,167
	Program Execution Delays		−1,500
7	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	59,626	59,626
8	JATOS	2,869	2,869
9	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION	34,492	33,492
	Product Improvement Growth		−1,000
10	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION	37,234	37,234
11	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	36,275	36,275
12	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	46,192	46,192
13	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	11,310	10,079
	MK–62 Firing Device Contract Delay		−1,231
14	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION	4,105	4,105
15	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION	64,839	64,839
16	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES	15,329	15,329
17	40 MM, ALL TYPES	62,835	62,835
18	60MM, ALL TYPES	17,877	17,877
19	81MM, ALL TYPES	41,053	41,053
20	120MM, ALL TYPES	6,458	6,458
21	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES	2,937	2,937
22	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	9,298	8,092
	Funded Ahead of Need for Scorpion		−1,206
23	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	13,995	13,995
24	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	70,423	67,546
	Decrease to Reduce Backlog in MACS M232 Production		−2,877
25	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	19,464	19,464
26	FUZE, ALL TYPES	18,032	18,032
27	NON LETHALS	3,009	3,009
28	AMMO MODERNIZATION	8,985	8,985
29	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	4,269	4,269
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS	817,991	790,527
	SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY		
1	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	1,731,256	1,721,969
	Consolidated Afloat Navy Enterprise System Increment 1		−2,600
	Surface Electronic Warfare Improvement		−4,900

P–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
	AN/UPX–29		−1,787
2	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM (AP–CY)	908,313	908,313
3	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	3,441,452	3,430,343
	Sonar System Hardware Cost Growth		−5,795
	Modular Mast Cost Growth		−1,430
	Propulsor Cost Growth		−3,884
4	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE (AP–CY)	1,691,236	1,691,236
5	CVN REFUELING OVERHAUL	1,255,799	1,248,999
	SSDS Program Management Excess		−1,800
	SSDS Software Growth		−2,000
	CEC Testing and Evaluation Excess		−3,000
6	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS (AP–CY)	408,037	408,037
9	DDG 1000	186,312	77,512
	Volume Search Radar		−108,800
10	DDG–51	2,922,190	2,868,454
	MK–12 IFF Cost Growth		−4,986
	CIWS Block 1B Cost Growth		−2,256
	Exterior Communication System Cost Growth		−6,294
	Main Reduction Gear Systems Engineering Growth		−10,200
	Main Reduction Gear Contract Savings		−30,000
11	DDG–51 (AP–CY)	47,984	47,984
12	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP	1,230,984	1,168,984
	Cost Savings		−62,000
13	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (AP–CY)	278,351	190,351
	Program Reduction		−88,000
16	LHA REPLACEMENT (AP–CY)	949,897	942,837
	C4ISR Cost Growth		−5,174
	Rolling Airframe Missile System Cost Growth		−1,886
18	INTRATHEATER CONNECTOR	180,703	180,703
19	OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIPS	88,561	88,561
20	OUTFITTING	306,640	295,570
	JHSV–1 Outfitting Funding Phasing		−3,426
	LPD–25 Outfitting Funding Phasing		−2,500
	DDG–1000 PostDelivery Phasing		−1,757
	LPD–23 PostDelivery Phasing		−3,387
21	SERVICE CRAFT	13,770	13,770
22	LCAC SLEP	83,035	83,035
	TOTAL, SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY	15,724,520	15,366,658
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
1	LM–2500 GAS TURBINE	12,137	10,525
	Turbine Digital Fuel Controls Cost Growth		−1,612
2	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE	14,923	14,923
4	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	23,167	23,167
5	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	85,619	73,559
	AN/BVS–1 Mast Tech Insertion Spares		−1,849
	ISIS Tech Insertion Kits Ahead of Need		−2,769
	Support Funding Carryover		−1,700
	Contractor Repair Funding Growth		−5,742
6	DDG MOD	296,691	289,691
	Multi-Mission BMD Capability Upgrade Kits Cost Growth		−1,000
	Engineering Services Unjustified Cost Growth		−6,000
7	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	11,974	9,304
	Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus Kits Excess to Requirements		−1,570
	Support Funding Carryover		−1,100
8	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	3,962	2,362
	Unjustified Request		−1,600
9	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	25,614	25,614
10	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	7,730	7,730
11	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	132,039	130,039
	Spare Main Propulsion Shaft Ahead of Need		−2,000
12	SUBMARINE BATTERIES	44,057	31,057
	Support Funding Carryover		−1,500
	Excess Installation Funding		−11,500
13	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	22,811	22,811
14	DSSP EQUIPMENT	3,869	3,869
15	CG-MODERNIZATION	356,958	350,958
	Engineering Services Unjustified Cost Growth		−6,000
16	LCAC	9,142	2,642
	Personnel Transport Module Contract Delay		−6,500
18	UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS	15,908	15,908
19	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	126,842	119,698
	LCS Waterjets Spares Ahead of Need		−5,296
	Voltage Regulators Ahead of Need		−1,848
20	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS	7,470	7,470
21	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	13,016	13,016
22	REACTOR POWER UNITS	438,503	438,503
23	REACTOR COMPONENTS	266,469	266,469
24	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT	10,227	10,227
25	STANDARD BOATS	27,725	49,225
	Range Support Craft		+21,500
26	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT	16,094	16,094
27	OPERATING FORCES IPE	49,856	91,476
	Program Increase—Shipyard Capital Investment Program		+41,620
28	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS	116,829	116,829
29	LCS MODULES	82,951	41,369
	MCM Module Production Support Growth		−6,000
	Consulting Services Growth		−3,064
	Excess Remote MultiMission Vehicle Funding		−7,600
	Mission Package Computer Environment Units Ahead of Need		−2,268
	AN/AQS–20A—Ahead of Need		−22,650
30	LSD MIDLIFE	106,612	102,612
	60-ton Deck Crane Contract Delay		−1,000
	Boat Davit and Ballast Control System Installations Ahead of Need		−3,000
31	RADAR SUPPORT	12,030	7,000
	Periscope Detection Radar Installation Funding Ahead of Need		−3,500
	Excess Miscellaneous Funding		−1,530
32	SPQ–9B RADAR	8,887	5,687
	Excess Antenna Funding		−2,200
	Support Funding Carryover		−1,000
33	AN/SQQ–89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	87,219	85,219
	Support Funding Carryover		−2,000
34	SSN ACOUSTICS	237,015	234,015
	Installation Costs Unjustified Growth		−3,000
35	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	29,641	27,241
	Common Data Link Modification Installation Funding Ahead of Need		−2,400
36	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS	14,056	13,056
	TR–317 Module Cost Growth		−1,000
37	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM	20,739	18,539
	Next Generation Countermeasure Funding Ahead of Need		−2,200
38	SSTD	2,206	0
	AN/SLQ–25D Ahead of Need		−2,206
39	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	57,481	57,481

P–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
40	SURTASS	8,468	8,468
41	TACTICAL SUPPORT CENTER	18,586	18,586
42	AN/SLQ–32	49,677	23,257
	Support Funding Carryover		−2,000
	Block 1B3 Incremental Funding		−7,520
	Block 2 Incremental Funding		−16,900
43	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT	105,624	105,624
44	AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AIS)	1,299	1,299
45	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG	71,558	70,108
	ESM Capability Insertion (CI–06) Kits Ahead of Need		−1,450
46	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	31,091	25,691
	Planar Antenna Funding Ahead of Need		−5,400
47	TRUSTED INFORMATION SYSTEM (TIS)	338	338
48	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)	33,358	33,358
49	ATDLS	2,273	2,273
50	NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NCCS)	8,920	8,920
51	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	81,441	60,710
	Remote Minehunting System (RMS)		−5,027
	Support Funding Carryover		−2,272
	Expendable Mine Neutralization System Funding Ahead of Need		−12,432
	Assessment and Identification of Mine Susceptibility Growth		−1,000
52	SHALLOW WATER MCM	9,236	1,261
	Cobra Block 1 Contract Delay		−7,975
53	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)	9,319	9,319
54	ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV	3,328	3,328
55	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	4,248	4,248
56	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	29,061	27,761
	COTS Obsolescence Growth		−1,300
57	MATCALS	16,747	14,747
	ASPARCS Cost Growth		−2,000
58	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	7,658	7,658
59	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	15,169	10,782
	AN/SPN–46 Radar Modification Kits Ahead of Need		−4,387
60	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	17,531	17,531
61	AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	6,851	6,851
62	MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM	8,551	8,551
63	ID SYSTEMS	29,572	23,122
	AN/URN–25 TACAN Upgrade Kits Ahead of Need		−2,450
	Support Funding Carryover		−4,000
64	TAC A/C MISSION PLANNING SYS (TAMPS)	9,098	7,798
	Support Funding Carryover		−1,300
65	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONT	8,542	8,542
66	TADIX–B	6,909	2,944
	AN/USC–151 Upgrade Kit Ahead of Need		−3,965
67	GCCS–M EQUIPMENT TACTICAL/MOBILE	9,832	9,832
68	DCGS–N	16,634	16,634
69	CANES	34,398	10,264
	Funded Ahead of Need		−24,134
70	RADIAC	6,104	5,197
	Air Particulate Detector Contract Delay		−907
71	CANES–INTELL	10,432	3,140
	Ahead of Need		−7,292
72	GPETE	5,861	5,861
73	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	4,445	4,445
74	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	4,737	4,737
75	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	51,048	29,307
	SPS–73 Tech Refresh/Obsolescence Growth		−741
	SPS–48 ECO and Support Cost Growth		−3,000
	SPS–48 Upgrade Kits Ahead of Need		−13,600
	Installation Funding Ahead of Need		−4,400
78	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION	260,551	230,174
	Support Funding Carryover		−1,500
	ISNS Upgrade Kits Installation Funding Ahead of Need		−9,000
	CENTRIXS Installation Funding Ahead of Need		−1,425
	SCI Network Installation Funding Ahead of Need		−2,100
	ADNS Units Ahead of Need		−16,352
79	MARITIME DOMAIN AWARENESS (MDA)	9,250	7,650
	CENTRIXS Modification Kit Installation Funding Ahead of Need		−1,600
80	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M	39,846	31,169
	Battle Force Tactical Network Ahead of Need		−8,677
82	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	59,013	55,737
	Common Submarine Radio Room Modification Kit Cost Growth		−1,029
	CSSR Seawolf Ahead of Need		−2,247
83	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	28,665	28,665
84	NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT)	161,021	161,021
85	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT	2,256	2,256
86	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS	1,309	1,309
87	NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS	3,422	3,422
88	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	120,529	114,357
	SV–21 Unit Cost Growth		−1,672
	Support Funding Carryover		−2,000
	CND Increment 2 Ahead of Need		−2,500
89	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP	18,322	18,322
90	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT	20,189	20,189
92	SONOBUOYS—ALL TYPES	87,846	83,846
	Support Funding Carryover		−4,000
93	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	51,742	59,700
	East Coast USWTR Support Funding Carryover		−3,500
	East Coast USWTR Ahead of Need		−8,542
	Training Range Upgrades		+20,000
94	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS	8,429	8,429
95	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT	11,134	11,134
96	AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT	37,063	28,881
	Advanced Recovery Control and Aviation Data Management and Control Systems Cost Growth		−1,782
	Support Funding Carryover		−1,400
	Production Engineering Unjustified Cost Growth		−5,000
97	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT	25,581	25,581
98	OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	1,573	1,573
99	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT	40,696	24,796
	JHMCS Ahead of Need		−15,900
100	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES	35,855	35,855
101	LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT	20,662	16,382
	Units Ahead of Need		−4,280
102	PORTABLE ELECTRONIC MAINTENANCE AIDS	12,812	10,612
	Production Support Growth		−2,200
103	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	12,018	12,018
104	NAVAL FIRES CONTROL SYSTEM	1,086	1,086
105	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT	8,076	8,076
106	NATO SEASPARROW	11,121	10,161
	ECP and Production Support Growth		−960
107	RAM GMLS	11,805	6,800
	GMLS Ordalts Contract Delay		−5,005
108	SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM	54,290	45,902
	Ship Self Defense System Modification Kits Ahead of Need		−8,388

P–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
109	AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	162,307	82,307
	COTS Tech Refresh Growth		−3,000
	Ship Change Documentation Growth		−4,500
	Navy Requested Transfer to RDTE,DW line 84 for Ballistic Missile Defense		−72,500
110	TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	88,698	88,698
111	VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS	5,698	5,698
112	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP	184,034	159,034
	Fire Control Tech Refresh Growth		−5,000
	Contract Delays		−20,000
113	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	88,004	77,390
	TI–04 Modification Contract Savings		−2,214
	Excess TI–04 and Out Modification Installation Funding		−8,400
114	SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	5,282	5,282
115	SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	8,323	8,323
116	ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	7,121	7,121
117	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	58,288	58,288
118	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	3,546	2,480
	Industrial Facilities Contract Delay		−1,066
119	ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM	36,588	36,588
120	SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	7,337	7,337
121	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	34,519	34,519
122	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	3,719	3,719
123	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS	584	584
124	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP	13,935	10,435
	Contract Delays		−3,500
125	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT	12,853	12,853
126	TACTICAL VEHICLES	31,741	25,241
	FMTV Contract Savings		−2,300
	Energy Initiative Unjustified Requirement		−4,200
127	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	3,132	3,132
128	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	5,154	5,154
129	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION	24,770	24,770
130	PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES	1,128	1,128
131	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	15,504	14,030
	General Purpose Forklift Cost Growth		−1,474
132	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	6,655	6,655
133	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	6,315	6,315
134	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS	66,549	66,549
135	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	11,429	11,429
137	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	47,306	37,840
	BUPERS Software Cost Growth		−2,500
	SPAWAR Hardware Items Cost Growth		−1,080
	ERP Kits Cost Growth		−900
	JFCOM National Small Unit Center		−3,075
	Future Pay and Personnel System Ahead of Need		−1,911
138	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	2,067	2,067
139	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	7,679	5,679
	Fleet Allowance List Outfitting Cost Growth		−2,000
141	NAVAL MIP SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	1,433	1,433
143	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	12,754	12,754
144	C4ISR EQUIPMENT	5,317	5,317
145	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	20,033	20,033
146	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	154,805	141,475
	Shipboard Protection System Installation Costs Excess to Need		−5,500
	Shipboard Protection System Support Cost Growth		−6,000
	Biometrics Ahead of Need		−1,830
XX	PROCUREMENT INNOVATION		15,000
	Procurement Innovation		+15,000
147	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	377,353	159,653
	Navy Requested Transfer to OM,N AGSAG BSIT for NGEN		−217,700
149	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	215,906	215,906
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	19,767	19,767
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	6,450,208	5,804,963
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		
1	AAV7A1 PIP	7,749	7,749
2	LAV PIP	41,277	41,277
4	EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	9,723	9,723
5	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	10,356	10,356
6	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM	22,230	22,230
7	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION	26,091	26,091
9	MODIFICATION KITS	40,916	30,559
	Unexecutable Program—M1A1 Survivability Kits		−10,357
10	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM	13,115	13,115
11	GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE	5,175	3,855
	Program Adjustment		−1,320
13	FOLLOW ON TO SMAW	21,570	21,570
14	ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS SYSTEM—HEAVY (AAWS–H)	20,315	20,315
15	MODIFICATION KITS	3,798	3,798
16	COMBAT OPERATIONS CENTER	10,776	10,776
17	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT	25,636	25,636
18	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	32,877	32,877
20	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)	3,405	3,405
21	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS	67,568	67,568
22	RADAR SYSTEMS	860	860
23	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	3,906	3,906
24	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	92,377	92,377
25	RQ–11 UAV	32,490	16,490
	Program Delay—Tier 2 UAS		−16,000
26	DCGS–MC	4,582	0
	DCGS–MC Program Delay		−4,582
28	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES	258,947	218,947
	Unjustified Request—MC Intranet		−40,000
29	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS	33,021	33,021
30	RADIO SYSTEMS	40,551	20,051
	Program Delay—JTRS handheld		−20,500
31	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS	32,279	22,279
	Execution Delay—WNS–T		−10,000
32	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT	15,278	15,278
33	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES	1,157	1,157
34	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES	12,696	12,696
35	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)	4,849	0
	Service Requested Reduction		−4,849
36	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS	5,253	5,253
37	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT	11,721	11,721
38	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	133,827	133,827
39	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS	19,156	19,156
40	TRAILERS	8,075	8,075
41	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	6,016	6,016
42	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT	5,110	5,110
43	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT	10,743	10,743
44	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS	29,330	29,330
45	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED	19,419	19,419

P–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
46	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	11,718	11,718
47	EOD SYSTEMS	64,093	64,093
48	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	16,419	16,419
49	GARRISON MOBILE ENGR EQUIP	10,976	10,976
50	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	24,376	24,376
51	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	2,748	2,748
52	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	6,722	6,722
53	TRAINING DEVICES	5,668	5,668
54	CONTAINER FAMILY	897	897
55	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT	18,261	18,261
57	BRIDGE BOATS	12,567	12,567
58	RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN	4,283	4,283
59	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	7,572	7,572
60	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	13,524	13,524
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	1,344,044	1,236,436
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
1	F–35	3,729,242	4,064,442
.....	Air Force Requested Transfer from AP,AF line 43	.....	+29,700
.....	Production Support Carryover	.....	−60,000
.....	Delete Five Aircraft	.....	−608,500
.....	Transfer Eight Aircraft from STOVL Variant	.....	974,000
2	F–35 (AP–CY)	257,000	257,000
3	F–22A	158,039	158,039
5	C–17A (MYP)	14,283	48,683
.....	Air Force Requested Transfer from AP, AF line 88	.....	+114,400
.....	Slow Execution	.....	−80,000
6	C–130J	463,267	455,267
.....	Updated Pricing	.....	−8,000
7	C–130J ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	48,000	40,000
.....	Updated Pricing	.....	−8,000
8	HC–130J	349,300	307,800
.....	Updated Pricing	.....	−41,500
9	HC–130J (AP–CY)	10,000	10,000
10	MC–130J	467,465	415,465
.....	Updated Pricing	.....	−52,000
11	MC–130J (APCY)	60,000	60,000
14	JOINT CARGO AIRCRAFT	351,200	351,200
15	LIGHT MOBILITY AIRCRAFT	65,699	65,699
16	USAFA POWERED FLIGHT PROGRAM	4,099	4,099
18	COMM VERT LIFT SPT PLATFORM (UH–1N)	6,432	0
.....	Air Force Requested Transfer to RDTE,AF line 113	.....	−6,432
19	V–22 OSPREY	393,098	393,098
20	V–22 OSPREY (AP–CY)	13,621	13,621
24	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	2,424	2,424
25	HH–60M OPERATIONAL LOSS REPLACEMENT	104,447	104,447
27	STUASLO	3,253	3,253
28	TARGET DRONES	85,505	85,505
29	C–37A	52,000	52,000
30	RQ–4 UAV	649,629	503,029
.....	Air Force Requested Transfer to AP, AF line 31	.....	−25,600
.....	Unjustified Cost Increase, Sensors	.....	−11,000
.....	Unjustified Request, Spares	.....	−110,000
31	RQ–4 UAV (AP–CY)	90,200	72,300
.....	Air Force Requested Transfer from AP,AF line 30	.....	+25,600
.....	Air Force Adjustment	.....	−43,500
32	MC 130 IN BA 04	9,932	0
.....	Air Force Requested Transfer to AC–130 Recap Program	.....	−9,932
xx	AC–130 Recap	.....	9,932
.....	Air Force Requested Transfer from MC–130 program	.....	+9,932
34	MQ–9	863,595	318,131
.....	Spares	.....	−167,788
.....	Support Equipment—Forward Funding	.....	−42,000
.....	Production Support—Forward Funding	.....	−98,376
.....	Funded Ahead of Need	.....	−21,300
.....	Transfer 12 Aircraft to Title IX	.....	−216,000
35	B–2A	63,371	63,371
37	B–1B	200,090	200,090
38	B–52	69,074	21,074
.....	CONECT—Funded Ahead of Need	.....	−35,000
.....	Transfer to RDTE, AF line 117 for Internal Weapons Bay	.....	−13,000
39	A–10	165,361	187,361
.....	Program Increase—Helmet Mounting Cueing System	.....	+22,000
40	F–15	302,235	337,041
.....	C/D Flight Data Recorder—Early to Need	.....	−11,408
.....	Emodel Flight Data Recorder—Early to Need	.....	−11,786
.....	Program Reduction	.....	−4,000
.....	AESA Radar for ANG F–15Cs	.....	+62,000
41	F–16	167,188	167,188
42	F–22A	492,199	437,739
.....	Unjustified Request	.....	−54,460
43	F–35 MODIFICATIONS	123,936	4,636
.....	Funded Ahead of Need	.....	−82,000
.....	Air Force Requested Transfer to AP, AF line 1	.....	−29,700
.....	Air Force Requested Transfer to RDTE, AF line 81 for Auto GCAS	.....	−7,600
44	C–5	740,369	37,252
.....	Block Upgrade Ahead of Need	.....	−21,260
.....	Funded Ahead of Need	.....	−5,400
.....	Transfer C5 RERP to New AP, AF Line	.....	−676,457
45	C–5 (APCY)	166,900	106,900
.....	Funded with fiscal year 2009 and 2010 funds	.....	−60,000
xx	C–5 RERP	.....	676,457
.....	Transfer C5 RERP from AP, AF line 44	.....	+676,457
46	C–9C	10	0
.....	Program Terminated	.....	−10
47	C–17A	351,614	217,547
.....	OBIGGS Kits–Reduction of Four kits	.....	−13,800
.....	Extended Range Retrofits Kits–Reduction of One Kit	.....	−5,267
.....	Excess to Need	.....	−98,000
.....	Funded Ahead of Need	.....	−17,000
48	C–21	339	339
49	C–32A	12,113	12,113
50	C–37A	12,162	12,162
51	GLIDER MODS	120	120
52	T–6	24,644	24,644
53	T–1	83	83
54	T–38	28,288	26,288
.....	Funded Ahead of Need	.....	−2,000
56	KC–10A (ATCA)	13,777	11,777
.....	Funded Ahead of Need	.....	−2,000
57	C–12	7,645	7,645
58	MC–12W	10,826	10,826
59	C–20 MODS	736	736

P–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
60	VC–25A MOD	13,175	13,175
61	C–40	10,697	10,697
62	C–130	257,339	296,939
	Air Force Requested Transfer from RDTE,AF line 220 for Avionics Upgrades to Special Mission Aircraft		+65,000
	Excess to Need		−25,400
63	C–130 MODS INTEL	3,963	3,963
64	C–130J MODS	80,205	64,205
	Contract Slip Crashworthy Seats		−16,000
65	C–135	44,228	37,428
	Block 45 Contract Delay		−8,400
	Low Cost Modifications		+1,600
66	COMPASS CALL MODS	176,558	101,558
	EC–130 Program Full Funding Violation		−75,000
67	DARP	105,540	105,540
68	E–3	195,163	195,163
69	E–4	37,526	37,526
70	E–8	188,504	6,397
	E–8 Reengining Ahead of Need		−120,407
	Engine Installs Ahead of Need		−5,000
	Funded Ahead of Need		−56,700
71	H–1	2,457	2,457
72	H–60	11,630	41,930
	Funded Ahead of Need		−1,700
	Simulators and Low Cost Modifications		+32,000
73	RQ–4 UAV MODS	119,415	116,415
	Unjustified Cost Increase ASIP sensors		−3,000
74	HC/MC–130 MODIFICATIONS	1,944	1,944
75	OTHER AIRCRAFT	159,423	15,723
	Transfer FABT Funds to RDTE,AF line 180		−119,700
	Delete FABT Funds Early to Need		−24,000
76	MQ–1 MODS	208,213	20,213
	Excess to Need		−188,000
77	MQ–9 MODS	108,922	0
	Contract Delay GCS		−50,884
	Contract Delay Reaper Retrofits		−58,038
78	MQ–9 PAYLOAD UAS	115,383	0
	Transfer to Title IX		−115,383
79	CV–22 MODS	13,964	13,964
80	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	622,020	698,220
	Unjustified Request Joint Stars Reengining Spares		−11,700
	Program Increase F22 Engine Spares		+100,000
	Excess to Need		−12,100
81	AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP	91,701	58,301
	Underexecution		−20,000
	Funded Ahead of Need		−13,400
82	B–1	6,791	6,791
83	B–2A	26,217	26,217
84	B–52	3,443	1,743
	Funded Ahead of Need		−1,700
85	C–5	195	195
87	KC–10A (ATCA)	5,702	5,702
88	C–17A	153,347	20,947
	Air Force Requested Transfer to AP,AF line 5		−114,400
	Unjustified Funding for Shutdown Activities		−18,000
89	C–130	28,295	28,295
91	F–15 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	21,599	17,599
	Excess to Need		−4,000
92	F–16 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	17,838	12,738
	Excess to Need		−5,100
93	T–6	9,450	9,450
94	OTHER AIRCRAFT	53,953	53,953
96	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	24,619	24,619
97	WAR CONSUMABLES	92,939	92,939
98	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	1,079,742	912,372
	Funded Ahead of Need		−6,732
	Transfer to Title IX		−160,638
99	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES MQ1	37,500	37,500
104	DARP	19,117	19,117
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	12,981	12,981
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	15,366,508	13,483,739
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
1	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQBALLISTIC	60,647	60,647
2	JASSM	215,825	215,825
3	SIDEWINDER (AIM9X)	64,523	64,523
4	AMRAAM	355,358	348,358
	Support Funding Carryover		−7,000
5	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	44,570	44,570
6	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	134,884	119,884
	Accounting Error		−15,000
7	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS/POLLUTION PREVENTION	833	833
8	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	48	48
9	MM III MODIFICATIONS	123,378	133,178
	Air Force Requested Transfer from RDTE, AF line 175 for MEECN		+9,800
10	AGM–65D MAVERICK	260	260
11	AGM–88A HARM	4,079	4,079
12	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE	10,795	10,795
13	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	43,192	43,192
14	ADVANCED EHF	38,078	38,078
15	ADVANCED EHF (APCY)	208,520	208,520
16	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES	517,601	517,601
17	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES (APCY)	58,110	58,110
18	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	122,490	122,490
19	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)	14,894	14,894
20	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)	64,609	64,609
23	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG (SPACE)	88,719	88,719
24	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH (SPACE)	1,153,976	1,153,976
26	SBIR HIGH (SPACE)	700,704	700,704
27	SBIR HIGH (SPACE) (APCY)	270,000	270,000
28	NATL POLARORBITING OP ENV SATELLITE	26,308	0
	Program Termination Early to Need		−26,308
33	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS	247,584	247,584
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	893,287	893,287
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	5,463,272	5,424,764
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		
1	ROCKETS	19,106	19,106
2	CARTRIDGES	141,049	141,049
3	PRACTICE BOMBS	34,094	23,442
	BDU56A/B CDI Program Delay		−10,652
4	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	183,845	183,845
5	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	104,642	179,361

P–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
.....	Additional JDAM for War Reserve Stockpile	.....	+74,719
6	CAD/PAD	37,016	37,016
7	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD)	3,383	3,383
8	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	1,000	1,000
9	MODIFICATIONS	1,112	1,112
10	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	5,015	5,015
11	FLARES	72,758	72,758
12	FUZES	57,337	57,337
13	SMALL ARMS	7,063	7,063
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	667,420	731,487
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
1	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLE	29,207	29,207
2	FAMILY MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE	45,618	37,618
.....	Contract Savings	.....	−8,000
3	CAP VEHICLES	902	902
4	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (CARGO)	31,773	31,773
5	SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES	52,867	48,867
.....	Up-Armored HMMWV Unjustified Cost Growth	.....	−4,000
6	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M	18,358	18,358
7	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES	26,924	26,924
9	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	14,501	14,501
10	RUNWAY SNOW REMOVAL & CLEANING EQUIP	25,404	25,404
11	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M	54,570	54,570
13	COMSEC EQUIPMENT	216,381	180,381
.....	Unjustified Growth	.....	−36,000
14	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)	1,582	0
.....	Undefined Requirement	.....	−1,582
15	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT	2,634	2,634
16	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIP	30,685	30,685
17	TRAFFIC CONTROL/LANDING	6,517	6,517
18	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM	112,056	88,940
.....	Site Activation Ahead of Need	.....	−23,116
19	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPRO	55,326	55,326
20	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST	21,018	18,045
.....	OS–21 Contract Delays	.....	−2,973
21	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL	28,164	28,164
22	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	18,416	15,716
.....	Contract Delays	.....	−2,700
23	TAC SIGINT SPT	377	377
25	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	74,285	74,285
26	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYSTEM	9,210	9,210
27	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	8,688	7,388
.....	Contract Delays	.....	−1,300
28	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	99,281	99,281
29	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	29,637	49,637
.....	Training Range Enhancements	.....	+20,000
30	C3 COUNTERMEASURES	11,112	11,112
31	GCSS–AF FOS	53,349	31,335
.....	ECSS Ahead of Need	.....	−20,914
.....	CMOS Excess to Need	.....	−1,100
32	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYS	20,525	20,525
33	AIR OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)	58,284	38,534
.....	Technical Refresh Unjustified Growth	.....	−15,000
.....	Recurring Events Unjustified Growth	.....	−4,750
34	INFORMATION TRANSPORT SYSTEMS	101,993	56,993
.....	Unjustified Growth	.....	−45,000
35	BASE INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE	193,830	113,830
.....	Unjustified Growth	.....	−80,000
36	AFNET	151,643	91,643
.....	Unjustified Growth	.....	−60,000
37	VOICE SYSTEMS	25,399	15,399
.....	Unjustified Growth	.....	−10,000
38	USCENTCOM	36,020	36,020
39	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PROG SPACE	24,804	24,804
40	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	5,279	5,279
41	NUDET DETECTION SYS (NDS) SPACE	5,926	5,926
42	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE	60,383	60,383
43	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE	91,004	91,004
44	MILSATCOM SPACE	221,545	190,717
.....	FAB–T Early to Need	.....	−7,538
.....	AFWET Modernization Enterprise Terminal Ahead of Need	.....	−23,290
45	SPACE MODS SPACE	18,384	18,384
46	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM	18,801	18,801
47	TACTICAL CE EQUIPMENT	268,140	242,995
.....	JTC Training and Rehearsal System Ahead of Need	.....	−25,145
48	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATER	34,925	34,925
49	RADIO EQUIPMENT	14,541	7,041
.....	Contract Delays	.....	−7,500
50	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT	11,613	11,613
51	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	108,308	108,308
52	COMM ELECT MODS	74,356	68,538
.....	ILS Ahead of Need	.....	−2,300
.....	BMEWS Ahead of Need	.....	−2,000
.....	OS–21 Contract Delays	.....	−1,518
53	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	20,873	14,573
.....	Night Vision Cueing and Display Contract Delays	.....	−6,300
54	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (SAFETY)	14,292	14,292
55	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING	12,853	12,853
56	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	4,788	4,788
57	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS	28,390	27,190
.....	Rapid Airfield Damage Assessment System Ahead of Need	.....	−1,200
58	PRODUCTIVITY CAPITAL INVESTMENT	1,879	1,879
59	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	38,558	38,558
60	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (BASE SUPPORT)	4,989	4,989
62	DARP RC135	23,296	23,296
63	DISTRIBUTED GROUND SYSTEMS	271,015	264,015
.....	Program Reduction	.....	−7,000
65	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM	489,680	439,680
.....	Classified Adjustment	.....	−50,000
66	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM	32,668	32,668
XX	PROCUREMENT INNOVATION	.....	15,000
.....	Procurement Innovation	.....	+15,000
70	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	19,046	19,046
.....	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	14,258,508	14,396,445
.....	Classified Adjustment	.....	+137,937
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	17,845,380	17,568,091
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSEWIDE		
1	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, BTA	4,000	4,000
2	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCCA, ITEMS LESS THAN $5M	1,477	1,477
3	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA	2,052	2,052

P–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
4	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA, PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	32,263	32,263
17	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY	14,625	14,625
18	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYS	5,275	5,275
19	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	2,803	2,803
20	TELEPORT PROGRAM	78,227	78,227
21	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M	153,288	153,288
22	NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	4,391	4,391
23	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS NETWORK	86,206	86,206
24	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE	1,710	1,710
27	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	22,493	22,493
28	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA	4,846	4,846
29	COST	10,478	10,478
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA,.		
30	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS	1,451	1,451
31	VEHICLES	50	50
32	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	12,007	12,007
34	TERMINAL HIGH ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE FIELDING	858,870	586,870
.....	Production Delay Due to Investigation of Failed Safety Component	.....	−272,000
35	AEGIS FIELDING	94,080	94,080
35A	ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	0	205,000
.....	Iron Dome Program	.....	+205,000
45	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	2,546	2,546
50	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD	124,050	124,050
51	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, INTELLIGENCE	20,138	20,138
53	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS	11,526	11,526
54	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS	27,179	27,179
55	SOF ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT	79,840	79,840
55A	MH–47G	0	100,449
.....	SOCOM Requested Transfer from P,DW line 56	.....	+100,449
56	MH–47 SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM	107,934	7,485
.....	SOCOM Requested Transfer to P,DW line 55A	.....	−100,449
57	MH–60 SOF MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	179,375	137,875
.....	SOCOM Requested Transfer to RDTE,DW line 268	.....	−25,100
.....	Quantity Reduction Due to Program Delay	.....	−16,400
58	NON-STANDARD AVIATION	179,949	58,681
.....	Medium NSAV—Transfer to Title IX	.....	−121,268
60	SOF TANKER RECAPITALIZATION	19,996	4,996
.....	Contract Delays	.....	−15,000
61	SOF U–28	404	404
62	RQ–11 UAV	2,090	2,090
63	CV–22 SOF MODIFICATION	124,035	124,035
64	MQ–1 UAV	1,948	1,948
65	MQ–9 UAV	1,965	1,965
66	STUASLO	12,148	12,148
67	C–130 MODIFICATIONS	22,500	9,261
.....	Low Cost Modifications—Execution	.....	−7,039
.....	Aircrew Situational Awareness System	.....	−6,200
68	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	489	489
69X	PROCUREMENT INNOVATION	0	15,000
.....	Procurement Innovation	.....	+15,000
70	MK VIII MOD 1—SEAL DELIVERY VEH	823	823
71	SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT	79,608	79,608
72	SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION	24,215	24,215
73	COMM EQUIPMENT & ELECTRONICS	58,390	44,390
.....	SOF Deployable Node Delays Due to Protests	.....	−14,000
74	SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	75,892	81,092
.....	Program Increase—Unfunded Requirement	.....	+5,200
75	SMALL ARMS & WEAPONS	30,094	30,094
76	DCGS–SOF	5,225	5,225
77	MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODS	206	206
79	SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS	11,706	8,306
.....	Unvalidated Requirement—Large SFA Craft	.....	−3,400
80	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	977	977
81	TACTICAL VEHICLES	30,965	33,365
.....	Program Increase—AFSOC Unfunded Requirement	.....	+2,400
82	MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATIONS SYSTEMS	28,354	18,354
.....	MH–60M Simulator Modernization Program	.....	−10,000
83	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS	20,000	20,000
84	MILCON COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT	102,556	102,556
88	SOF AUTOMATION SYSTEMS	52,353	52,353
89	SOF GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	9,714	9,714
90	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	30,900	30,900
91	SOF SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS	221	5,661
.....	Program Increase—Unfunded Requirement	.....	+5,440
92	SOF VISUAL AUGMENTATION, LASERS AND SENSOR SYSTEM	18,626	18,626
93	SOF TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS	35,234	37,554
.....	Program Increase—Unfunded Requirement	.....	+2,320
94	SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT	804	804
96	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	7,774	7,774
97	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	269,182	263,182
.....	Program Increase—HSAC Unfunded Requirement	.....	+4,000
.....	Program Adjustment	.....	−10,000
98	PSYOP EQUIPMENT	25,266	25,266
99	INSTALLATION FORCE PROTECTION	90,635	90,635
100	INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION	74,686	74,686
101	DECONTAMINATION	21,570	21,570
102	JOINT BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	19,389	10,389
.....	Reduction for Anthrax Vaccine Purchased by HHS	.....	−9,000
103	COLLECTIVE PROTECTION	27,542	27,542
104	CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE	136,114	136,114
.....	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	682,643	681,643
.....	Classified Adjustment	.....	−1,000
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, DEFENSEWIDE	4,280,368	4,009,321
	DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT		
.....	GALLIUM NITRIDE X-BAND MONOLITHIC MICROWAVE INTEGRATED CIRCUITS	2,000	2,000
.....	GALLIUM NITRIDE RADAR AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE MONOLITHIC MICROWAVE INTEGRATED CIRCUITS	8,579	8,579
.....	GALLIUM NITRIDE ADVANCED ELECTRONIC WARFARE MONOLITHIC MICROWAVE INTEGRATED CIRCUITS	2,000	2,000
.....	BERYLLIUM SUPPLY INDUSTRIAL BASE	6,897	6,897
.....	SPACE	770	770
.....	NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE INDUSTRIAL AND SUPPLY BASE RISK MITIGATION PROGRAM	8,500	10,900
.....	Program Increase	.....	+2,400
.....	ALTERNATIVE ENERGY FROM ORGANIC SOURCES	.....	3,200
	TOTAL, DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT	28,746	34,346
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT	111,189,951	102,121,873

R–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY		
1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	21,780	21,780

R–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	195,845	195,845
3	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	91,161	87,561
	V72–Transfer to D55		−3,300
	D55–Transfer from V72		+3,300
	V72–Non-Department of Defense funding		−3,600
4	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	98,087	98,087
5	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	29,882	29,882
6	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	48,929	48,929
7	TRACTOR HIP	14,624	14,624
8	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	43,476	43,476
9	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	17,330	17,330
10	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	49,525	49,525
11	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	18,190	18,190
12	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION	20,582	20,582
13	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	64,740	64,740
14	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	60,342	60,342
15	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	5,324	10,924
	Emerging Chemical Agent Threat		+5,600
16	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	7,893	7,893
17	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	42,645	42,645
18	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	60,859	60,859
19	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	40,228	40,228
20	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	19,118	19,118
21	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	21,042	21,042
22	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	18,364	22,364
	Research, Development and Engineering Command		+4,000
23	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	25,573	25,573
24	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	6,768	6,768
25	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	79,189	75,184
	Joint Integrated Base Defense Program Office transfer to line 60 at request of the Army		−4,005
26	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	22,198	22,198
27	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	27,746	27,746
28	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	96,797	96,797
29	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	37,364	37,364
30	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	71,510	115,510
	Peer-Reviewed Neurotoxin Exposure Treatment Parkinsons Research Program		+20,000
	Neurofibromatosis Research		+16,000
	Military Burn Trauma Research Program		+8,000
31	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	57,454	57,454
32	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	64,438	64,438
33	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADV TECHNOLOGY	89,499	125,819
	Alternative Energy		+36,320
34	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADV TECH	8,102	8,102
35	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADV TECH	7,921	7,921
36	ELECTRONIC WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	50,359	50,359
37	TRACTOR HIKE	8,015	8,015
38	NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS	15,334	15,334
39	TRACTOR ROSE	12,309	12,309
41	MILITARY HIV RESEARCH	6,688	26,688
	HIV Research		+20,000
42	COMBATING TERRORISM, TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	10,550	10,550
43	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	18,350	18,350
44	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	84,553	79,053
	P 704 excessive growth without strategy		−5,500
45	TRACTOR CAGE	9,986	9,986
46	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECH	26,953	26,953
47	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	9,151	9,151
48	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	39,912	39,912
49	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMO	15,878	15,878
50	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	27,393	24,393
	Program reduction		−3,000
51	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	24,873	24,873
53	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	11,455	11,455
54	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (SPACE)	27,551	27,551
56	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER–ADV DEV	15,596	15,596
57	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ADV DEV	2,425	2,425
58	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION	42,183	37,183
	AKE 120mm cartridge EMD Phase II contract award delay		−5,000
59	ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS)	136,302	207,702
	S-MOD milestone B delay		−57,000
	Stryker DVH		+128,400
60	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	18,556	8,239
	Joint Integrated Base Defense Program Office—Transfer from line 25 at request of the Army		+4,005
	REF funded in Title IX		−14,322
61	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM—AD	17,962	12,162
	Unsustained growth		−5,800
62	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	0	5,159
	CSP–Transfer from line 177 at request of the Army		+5,159
63	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	4,695	4,695
64	WARFIGHTER INFORMATION NETWORK—TACTICAL	190,903	190,903
65	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	5,060	5,060
66	AVIATION—ADV DEV	8,355	8,355
67	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ADV DEV	80,490	65,315
	JLTV EMD contract award delay		−15,175
68	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYSTEM EVALUATION	14,290	14,290
69	MEDICAL SYSTEMS—ADV DEV	28,132	28,132
70	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	48,323	48,323
71	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	970	970
72	ENDURANCE UAVS	93,000	93,000
73	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	89,210	74,210
	SOSCOE Apache Block III integration change in requirements		−15,000
74	ARMED, DEPLOYABLE OH–58D	72,550	72,550
75	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	172,269	149,755
	CIRCM test and evaluation funds requested ahead of need		−22,514
76	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	784	784
77	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	22,574	18,074
	EMD contract award delay		−4,500
78	TRACTOR CAGE	23,194	23,194
79	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	80,337	70,337
	S62—Milestone B delay		−10,000
80	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	3,710	3,710
81	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-SDD	5,335	5,335
82	JAVELIN	9,999	0
	Lack of acquisition strategy		−9,999
83	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES	3,519	3,519
84	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	9,892	9,892
85	LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES	1,990	1,990
86	NON-LINE OF SIGHT LAUNCH SYSTEM	81,247	0
	Program termination		−81,247
89	FCS SYSTEMS OF SYSTEMS ENGR & PROGRAM MGMT	568,711	498,711
	Program reduction		−70,000
90	FCS RECONNAISSANCE (UAV) PLATFORMS	50,304	50,304
91	FCS UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLES	249,948	200,000

R–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
	Program reduction		−49,948
92	FCS UNATTENDED GROUND SENSORS	7,515	7,515
93	FCS SUSTAINMENT & TRAINING R&D	610,389	610,389
95	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS—SDD	52,549	52,549
96	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	2,118	2,118
97	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES—SDD	27,756	27,756
98	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE	34,209	34,209
99	CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	30,291	30,291
100	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	14,041	14,041
101	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS)—SDD	15,547	15,547
103	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	27,670	27,670
105	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS—SDD	24,345	15,345
	PGK Increment II EMD delay		−9,000
106	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—SDD COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	41,039	41,039
107	SDD	90,736	75,736
	JBC–P unsustained growth		−15,000
108	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT	34,474	34,474
109	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER—SDD	95,577	49,577
	Project 016—Scorpion acceleration funded in prior approval reprogramming		−16,000
	Project 415—ASTAMIDS/GSTAMIDS lack of acquisition strategy		−30,000
110	ARTILLERY MUNITIONS	26,371	26,371
111	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION	29,884	3,000
	Unexecutable request		−26,884
112	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	60,970	60,970
113	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM (GFEBS)	13,576	13,576
114	FIREFINDER	24,736	24,736
115	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—WARRIOR DEM/VAL	20,886	20,886
116	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS	53,624	103,624
	Program Increase		+20,000
	Transfer from WTCV,A line 12 for Paladin PIM		+30,000
117	PATRIOT/MEADS COMBINED AGGREGATE PROGRAM	467,139	467,139
118	NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL MONITORING SENSOR NETWORK	7,276	7,276
119	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	23,957	23,957
120	ARMY INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM (A–IMH)	100,500	60,500
	Excessive growth without acquisition strategy		−40,000
121	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	130,340	130,340
122	SLAMRAAM	23,700	23,700
123	PAC–2/MSE MISSILE	62,500	62,500
124	ARMY INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AIAMD)	251,124	251,124
125	MANNED GROUND VEHICLE	934,366	461,100
	Program adjustment		−473,266
126	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR	211,500	211,500
127	TROJAN–RH12	3,697	3,697
128	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	21,571	13,571
	EW5—Unsustained growth		−8,000
129	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	26,158	26,158
130	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	8,614	8,614
131	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	42,102	42,102
132	RAND ARROYO CENTER	20,492	20,492
133	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	163,788	163,788
134	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	17,704	17,704
136	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	393,937	412,257
	Army Test Range Infrastructure unfunded requirement		+18,320
137	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	59,040	67,760
	Test and Evaluation Instrumentation unfunded requirement		+8,720
138	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	41,812	43,412
	Test and Evaluation Instrumentation unfunded requirement		+1,600
139	DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY	4,710	4,710
140	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	5,055	5,055
141	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	7,185	7,185
142	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	18,078	19,278
	Test and Evaluation Instrumentation unfunded requirement		+1,200
143	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	5,460	5,460
144	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	68,191	68,191
145	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	61,450	64,090
	Test and Evaluation Instrumentation unfunded requirement		+2,640
146	SIMULATION & MODELING FOR ACQ, RQTS, & TNG (SMART)	3,926	3,926
147	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	73,685	73,685
148	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND	48,309	48,309
149	SAFETY	53,338	44,042
	Project 862–155mm HE projectile underfunded new start		−9,296
150	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT	3,195	3,195
151	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)	16,154	16,154
153	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	51,619	25,619
	GMLRS AW EMD contract award delay		−26,000
154	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	372,493	372,493
155	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO CYBER (ISC) MIP	2,360	2,360
156	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	24,622	24,622
157	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	204,481	204,481
158	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	25,540	25,540
159	AIRCRAFT MODS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	134,999	124,856
	P430—Chinook RW crashworthy seating previously fully funded		−10,143
160	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROG	710	710
161	DIGITIZATION	6,329	6,329
162	FORCE XXI BATTLE COMMAND, BRIGADE AND BELOW (FBCB2)	3,935	3,935
163	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	24,280	24,280
165	TRACTOR CARD	14,870	14,870
167	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	12,403	12,403
168	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	3,153	3,153
171	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	54,784	11,905
	Protected Information—Biometrics—Transfer to line 171x		−42,879
171x	FAMILY OF BIOMETRICS	0	42,879
	Protected Information—Biometrics—Transfer from line 171		+42,879
172	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	125,569	125,569
173	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	33,694	33,694
174	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYS	13,024	13,024
177	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	54,300	49,141
	CSP—Transfer of HD IR funds to line 62 at request of the Army for execution		−5,159
178	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	103,002	103,002
179	MQ–1 SKY WARRIOR A UAV	123,156	123,156
180	RQ–11 UAV	1,599	1,599
181	RQ–7 UAV	7,805	7,805
183	BIOMETRICS ENABLED INTELLIGENCE	14,114	2,114
	Protected Information—Biometrics		−12,000
185	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	61,098	61,098
xx	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INNOVATION	0	105,000
	Research and Development Innovation		+105,000
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	4,447	4,447
	TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY	10,333,392	9,710,998
	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY		
1	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	108,679	108,679
2	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	17,979	17,979

R–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
3	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	429,767	429,767
4	POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	98,150	98,150
5	FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	107,448	147,448
	Alternative Energy		+40,000
6	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	43,776	43,776
8	COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH	70,168	70,168
9	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	113,724	113,724
10	RF SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH	83,902	83,902
11	OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	49,491	49,491
12	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH	6,002	6,002
13	UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	69,186	69,186
14	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	36,833	36,833
15	POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	117,908	117,908
16	FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	61,877	61,877
17	COMMON PICTURE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	96,720	96,720
18	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	98,261	98,261
19	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	82,143	82,143
20	MARINE CORPS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	115,089	115,089
21	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	11,131	11,131
22	WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	18,076	55,336
	C.W Bill Young Bone Marrow Donor Recruitment and Research Program		+31,500
	Program Increase—Tactical Athlete Program		+5,760
23	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	49,276	53,276
	Program Increase—ASW Research		+4,000
24	NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS	53,177	53,177
25	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	21,941	21,941
XX	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INNOVATION	0	105,000
	Research and Development Innovation		+105,000
26	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	123,331	118,331
	JMAPS program delay		−5,000
27	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	9,480	9,480
28	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL	4,275	4,275
29	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	8,249	8,249
30	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	6,452	6,452
31	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	1,658	1,658
32	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	81,347	79,247
	Unmanned Surface Sweep System program delay		−2,100
33	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	57,796	50,796
	Milestone B delay		−7,000
34	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	93,830	91,830
	Navy requested transfer to line 49 for Automatic Test and Re-Test		−2,000
35	SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT	51	51
36	PILOT FISH	81,784	81,784
37	RETRACT LARCH	142,858	142,858
38	RETRACT JUNIPER	134,497	134,497
39	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	1,358	1,358
40	SURFACE ASW	21,673	21,673
41	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	608,566	559,266
	Execution delays		−49,300
42	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	5,590	5,590
43	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	17,883	17,883
44	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	1,796	1,796
45	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	366,509	366,509
46	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	5,459	5,459
47	CHALK EAGLE	447,804	447,804
48	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS)	226,288	189,588
	LCS–2 post shakedown availability delay		−15,800
	LCS–1 post shakedown availability planning funding excess		−500
	NLOS missile termination		−15,400
	Program Increase—Mine Warfare Testing Disruption		+4,000
	Navy requested transfer to line 49 for Automatic Test and Re-Test		−2,000
	Program Increase—Small Business Technology Insertion (Mine Warfare Modules)		+8,000
	Savings from accelerated DT		−15,000
49	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	24,344	34,344
	Navy requested transfer from lines 34, 48, 107, 122 and 136 for Automatic Test and Re-Test		+10,000
50	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	5,388	5,388
51	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	242,765	222,765
	Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle		−165,000
	Termination Liability, or SDD if certified by the Secretary		+145,000
52	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	40,505	28,505
	JLTV EMD contract award delay		12,000
53	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	25,873	25,873
54	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	52,282	52,282
55	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	13,560	13,560
56	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	20,207	20,207
57	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	30,403	34,403
	Program Increase—Alternative Energy from Organic Sources		+4,000
58	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	3,746	3,746
59	CHALK CORAL	71,920	71,920
60	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	4,139	4,139
61	RETRACT MAPLE	219,463	219,463
62	LINK PLUMERIA	58,030	58,030
63	RETRACT ELM	183,187	183,187
64	SHIP SELF DEFENSE	4,385	4,385
65	LINK EVERGREEN	41,433	41,433
66	SPECIAL PROCESSES	36,457	36,457
67	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	9,196	9,196
68	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	905	905
69	NONLETHAL WEAPONS	43,272	43,272
70	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS	159,151	159,151
73	DIRECTED ENERGY AND ELECTRIC WEAPON SYSTEMS		8,000
	Directed Energy Development and Test		+8,000
74	TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES	51,693	51,693
75	JOINT COUNTER RADIO CONTROLLED IED ELECTRONIC WARFARE	56,542	50,242
	Program delay		−6,300
76	PRECISION STRIKE WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	25,121	25,121
77	SPACE & ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINE	34,793	34,793
78	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT—MIP	2,161	2,161
79	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS—MIP	4,253	4,253
80	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT—MIP	663	663
81	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	44,329	44,329
82	AV–8B AIRCRAFT—ENG DEV	22,867	22,867
83	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	45,667	45,667
84	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	55,792	55,792
85	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	5,735	5,735
86	P–3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	3,574	3,574
87	WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM	3,733	3,733
88	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	89,955	87,955
	Systems engineering growth		−2,000
89	ADVANCED HAWKEYE	171,132	171,132
90	H–1 UPGRADES	60,498	60,498
91	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	64,834	64,834
92	V–22A	46,070	44,425
	Fuel forward funded in fiscal year 2010 supplemental		−1,645

R–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
93	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	8,689	11,189
	Transfer from AP,N line 52 for Common Mobile Aircrew Restraint System		+2,500
94	EA–18	22,042	21,773
	Fuel forward funded in fiscal year 2010 supplemental		−269
95	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	80,819	80,819
96	VH–71A EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT	159,785	159,785
97	NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ)	120,602	90,602
	Technology development contract delay		−30,000
98	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM—NAVY (JTRS-NAVY)	687,723	627,723
	Airborne Maritime Fixed unjustified increase		−60,000
100	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	193,933	193,933
101	LPD–17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	1,373	1,373
102	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	44,091	24,091
	Program delay		−20,000
103	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	96,186	96,186
104	AIRBORNE MCM	45,885	45,885
105	NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL-COUNTER AIR SYSTEMS ENG	21,517	21,517
106	ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS	274,371	274,371
107	SSN–688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	118,897	112,197
	Navy requested transfer to line 49 for Automatic Test and Re-Test		−2,000
	Communications at Speed and Depth		−4,700
108	AIR CONTROL	5,665	5,665
109	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	70,117	70,117
110	COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION	5,044	5,044
111	NEW DESIGN SSN	155,489	171,489
	Program Increase—Small Business Technology Insertion		+16,000
112	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	50,537	50,537
113	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/LIVE FIRE T&E	153,686	166,686
	Full Ship Shock Trial Alternative transfer from line 136		+13,000
114	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	4,443	4,443
115	MINE DEVELOPMENT	5,455	5,455
116	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	25,282	25,282
117	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	10,489	10,489
118	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	10,759	10,759
119	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	12,567	12,567
120	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL)	45,930	45,930
121	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL)	5,860	5,860
122	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW)	84,525	82,525
	Navy requested transfer to line 49 for Automatic Test and Re-Test		−2,000
123	INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING	6,820	6,820
124	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	12,337	29,137
	Wound Care Research		+10,400
	Military Dental Research		+6,400
125	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	66,636	66,636
126	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)–EMD	667,916	613,864
	Block IV capabilities funding ahead of need		−29,052
	Underexecution of test program		−25,000
127	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)	707,791	676,806
	Block IV capabilities funding ahead of need		−29,000
	Fuel forward funded in fiscal year 2010 supplemental		−1,985
128	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	22,783	22,783
129	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	28,280	28,280
130	NAVY INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM	27,444	15,444
	Reduction to pre-development activities		−12,000
131	CH–53K	577,435	577,435
133	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	100,846	100,846
134	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA)	929,240	941,240
	Program Increase—Small Business Technology Insertion		+12,000
136	DDG–1000	549,241	534,241
	Navy requested transfer to line 49 for Automatic Test and Re-Test		−2,000
	Full Ship Shock Trial Alternative transfer to line 113		−13,000
137	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM—MIP	1,318	1,318
138	SSN–688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION—MIP	1,415	1,415
139	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS	17,019	12,387
	Execution delays		−4,632
140	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	18,755	18,755
141	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	66,066	66,066
142	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	37,522	37,522
143	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—NAVY	8,149	8,149
144	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	49,165	49,165
146	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	662	662
147	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	58,329	58,329
148	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	3,451	3,451
149	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	72,094	72,094
150	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	95,332	93,871
	Fuel forward funded in fiscal year 2010 supplemental		−1,461
151	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	376,418	376,418
152	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	15,746	15,746
153	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	4,013	4,013
154	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	19,700	19,700
155	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	17,721	17,721
156	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	1,859	1,859
157	SERVICE SUPPORT TO JFCOM, JNTC	4,260	4,260
161	UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE (UCAV) ADVANCED COMPONENT	266,368	266,368
162	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	81,184	71,184
	Conventional Trident Modification		−10,000
163	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	34,997	34,997
164	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	6,815	6,815
165	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	10,331	10,331
166	RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT)	35,120	35,120
167	F/A–18 SQUADRONS	148,438	148,438
168	E–2 SQUADRONS	19,011	19,011
169	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	26,894	26,894
170	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	10,587	10,587
171	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	23,464	23,464
172	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS	4,357	4,357
173	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	50,750	50,750
174	CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT	1,519	1,519
175	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	39,398	39,398
176	HARM IMPROVEMENT	14,207	12,207
	Systems engineering growth		−2,000
177	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	28,854	28,854
178	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	32,877	36,877
	Program Increase—Small Business Technology Insertion		+4,000
179	MK–48 ADCAP	26,234	34,234
	Program Increase—Small Business Technology Insertion		+8,000
180	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	133,611	100,890
	F–135 engine ahead of need		−27,000
	Multi-purpose bomb rack program delay		−5,721
181	NAVY SCIENCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	3,535	3,535
182	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	74,229	74,229
183	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	245,298	232,898
	Joint Cooperative Target Identification—Ground		−12,400
184	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	100,424	76,424

R–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
	Marine personnel carrier program delay		−20,000
	LAV–AT contract delay		−4,000
185	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	19,466	19,466
186	USMC INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	20,316	20,316
187	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	912	912
188	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	2,633	2,633
189	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	3,586	3,586
194	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	422,268	422,268
195	CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES	63,563	44,563
	Increment 1 transition contract delay		−19,000
196	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	25,934	25,934
199	CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES—MIP	8,375	8,375
201	COBRA JUDY	36,527	36,527
202	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC)	63,878	63,878
203	JOINT MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	4,435	4,435
204	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	35,212	18,912
	Marinized UAS		−16,300
206	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS		50,200
	Program increase		+5,200
	EP–3/SPA systems development		+45,000
207	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	19,263	19,263
208	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS/SURFACE SYSTEMS	8,377	8,377
209	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS/SURFACE SYSTEMS	16,665	16,665
210	RQ–4 UAV	529,250	529,250
211	MQ–8 UAV	10,665	10,665
212	RQ–11 UAV	512	512
213	RQ–7 UAV	934	934
214	SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASL0)	26,209	26,209
215	SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASL0)	18,098	12,710
	STUAS Lite termination		−5,388
218	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	8,158	8,158
219	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	18,649	18,649
220	AVIONICS COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	3,250	3,250
221	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	46,173	46,173
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,284,901	1,499,901
	Classified adjustment		+215,000
	TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY	17,693,496	17,736,303
	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE		
1	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	350,978	350,978
2	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	136,297	136,297
3	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES	13,198	13,198
4	MATERIALS	137,273	137,273
5	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES	144,699	144,699
6	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	87,452	87,452
7	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	207,049	204,049
	Unjustified program growth		−3,000
8	AEROSPACE SENSORS	157,497	159,897
	Program Increase—Materials for Structures, Propulsion, and Subsystems		+2,400
9	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	111,857	111,857
10	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	61,330	61,330
11	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	103,596	122,396
	Re-alignment of funding for ground optical imaging research and technology		+18,800
13	DOMINANT INFORMATION SCIENCES AND METHODS	117,283	115,783
	Transfer to line 11		−1,500
14	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH	53,384	53,384
15	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	33,414	40,414
	Transfer to line 11		−1,000
	Metals Affordability Initiative		+8,000
16	SUSTAINMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T)	2,935	2,935
17	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	44,677	44,677
18	AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO	53,588	52,588
	Transfer to line 11		−1,000
19	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	136,135	134,135
	Transfer to line 11		−2,000
21	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	16,992	16,992
22	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	83,705	80,115
	Transfer to line 11		−3,590
23	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	5,899	5,899
24	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	24,814	24,814
25	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	15,755	15,755
26	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	17,461	17,461
27	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	39,701	47,701
	Program Increase—Best Industrial Process for Department of Defense Depots		+8,000
28	BATTLESPACE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	32,382	32,382
30	HIGH ENERGY LASER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	1,847	1,847
XX	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INNOVATION	0	105,000
	Research and Development Innovation		+105,000
31	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	5,019	5,019
32	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	3,576	1,000
	Unjustified program request		−2,576
33	GPS III—OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT	0	356,867
	212		+356,867
34	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	351,817	394,817
	Program Increase—Capabilities Insertion Program		+43,000
35	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	164,232	164,232
36	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	45,012	45,012
37	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	26,172	36,172
	Program Increase—Automatic Dependent Surveillance—Broadcast		+10,000
38	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,372	4,372
39	INTERNATIONAL SPACE COOPERATIVE R&D	635	635
40	SPACE PROTECTION PROGRAM (SPP)	8,349	8,349
42	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	20,580	20,580
43	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE	66,745	66,745
44	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SYSTEM RDT&E (SPACE)	36,123	79,123
	Program Increase—Capabilities Insertion Program		+43,000
45	POLLUTION PREVENTION (DEM/VAL)	2,534	2,534
46	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS	13,952	13,952
47	NEXT GENERATION BOMBER	198,957	198,957
48	BATTLE MGMT COM & CTRL SENSOR DEVELOPMENT	0	12,000
	Program Increase—GMTI Radar Development		+12,000
49	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM	22,389	22,389
50	JOINT DUAL ROLE AIR DOMINANCE MISSILE	9,799	9,799
51	REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS AND MATURATION	34,339	34,339
52	NEXT-GENERATION MILSATCOM TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	0	20,000
	Program Increase—Acquisition Planning and Studies		+20,000
53	GROUND ATTACK WEAPONS FUZE DEVELOPMENT	32,513	22,513
	Program delay		−10,000
54	ALTERNATIVE FUELS	24,064	24,064
55	AUTOMATED AIR-TO-AIR REFUELING	85	85
56	OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE	93,978	125,978
	Program Increase—Responsive Launch Capabilities		+32,000
57	TECH TRANSITION PROGRAM	12,260	12,260

R–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
58	NATIONAL POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SAT	325,505	100,000
	Program Reduction		−225,505
58A	DEFENSE WEATHER SATELLITE SYSTEM (DWSS)		75,000
	DWSS-only for defense sensor development		+75,000
59	GLOBAL BROADCAST SERVICE (GBS)	18,171	18,171
60	NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT	60,545	60,545
62	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING	8,066	8,066
64	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	89,966	89,966
65	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	631	631
66	TACTICAL DATA NETWORKS ENTERPRISE	102,941	102,941
67	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	50	50
68	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	153,505	100,505
	SDB II—Contract Award Delay		−53,000
69	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	40,276	40,276
70	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS	426,525	350,425
	SBSS Follow On		−45,100
	Space Fence		−35,000
	Integration of Missile Defense Agency radar systems into Space Surveillance Network		+4,000
71	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK	25,937	25,937
72	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	530,047	530,047
74	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	6,693	6,693
75	SUBMUNITIONS	1,622	1,622
76	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	37,987	37,987
77	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	10,650	10,650
78	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	36,905	36,905
79	INTEGRATED COMMAND & CONTROL APPLICATIONS (IC2A)	10	10
80	INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT	1,364	1,364
81	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)	883,773	1,051,210
	Air Force requested transfer from line 135		+159,837
	Air Force requested transfer for Auto GCAS from AP, AF line 43		+7,600
82	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE	71,843	71,843
83	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)	30,245	55,245
	Program Increase—EELV Common Upper Stage		+25,000
85	NEXT GENERATION AERIAL REFUELING AIRCRAFT	863,875	0
	Transfer to Tanker Transfer Fund		−863,875
86	CSAR HH–60 RECAPITALIZATION	12,584	0
	Program Termination		−12,584
86A	HH–60 RDT&E	0	1,934
	Terrain and Traffic Avoidance Systems—Transfer from line 86		+1,934
88	HC/MC–130 RECAP RDT&E	15,536	15,536
91	SINGLE INTEGRATED AIR PICTURE (SIAP)	1,832	0
	Program termination		−1,832
92	FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING	57,393	57,393
94	JOINT CARGO AIRCRAFT (JCA)	26,407	26,407
95	CV–22	18,270	18,270
96	AIRBORNE SENIOR LEADER C3 (SLC3S)	15,826	7,826
	Contract award delay for SLC3S–A Communications Program (SCP)		−8,000
97	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	21,245	21,245
98	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	61,587	61,587
99	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	26,752	26,752
101	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	20,665	20,665
102	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	759,868	759,868
103	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	23,551	23,551
104	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	47,623	47,623
105	FACILITIES RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION—TEST & EVAL	46,327	46,327
106	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	27,579	27,579
107	MULTI-SERVICE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING INITIATIVE	18,901	18,901
108	ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	24,968	24,968
109	GENERAL SKILL TRAINING	1,544	1,544
111	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,764	3,764
113	COMMON VERTICAL LIFT SUPPORT PLATFORM	0	4,000
	Air Force requested transfer from AP, AF line 18		+4,000
114	AIR FORCE INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM	43,300	23,300
	Funding ahead of need		−20,000
115	ANTITAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY	42,255	42,255
117	B–52 SQUADRONS	146,096	140,896
	EHF Request—early to need		−24,700
	Program Increase to continue advanced targeting pod integration		+6,500
	Air Force requested transfer from AP, AF line 38 for Internal Weapons Bay		+13,000
118	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	3,631	3,631
119	B–1B SQUADRONS	33,234	33,234
120	B–2 SQUADRONS	260,466	276,466
	Program Increase—Mixed Loads and Other Capabilities		+16,000
121	STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM—USSTRATCOM	28,441	28,441
122	NIGHT FIST—USSTRATCOM	5,359	5,359
125	REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION	23,732	23,732
126	STRATEGIC AEROSPACE INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES	15	15
127	WARFIGHTER RAPID ACQUISITION PROCESS (WRAP) RAPID TRAN	10,580	10,580
128	MQ–9 UAV	125,427	125,427
129	MULTI-PLATFORM ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT	15,574	15,574
130	A–10 SQUADRONS	5,661	5,661
131	F–16 SQUADRONS	129,103	129,103
132	F–15E SQUADRONS	222,677	207,677
	Contract award delays		−15,000
133	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	12,937	12,937
134	F–22 SQUADRONS	576,330	511,330
	Modernization program		−100,000
	MADL—Transfer from line 155		+35,000
135	F–35 SQUADRONS	217,561	0
	Block 4 Development		−57,724
	Air Force requested transfer to line 81		−159,837
136	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	6,040	6,040
137	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	62,922	62,922
138	JOINT HELMET MOUNTED CUEING SYSTEM (JHMCS)	2,407	2,407
139	COMBAT RESCUE AND RECOVERY	944	944
140	COMBAT RESCUE—PARARESCUE	2,921	2,921
141	AF TENCAP	11,648	11,648
142	PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS PROCUREMENT	3,017	3,017
143	COMPASS CALL	20,652	20,652
144	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	147,396	120,626
	F–135 Component Improvement Program—premature request		−26,770
146	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	20,000	20,000
147	AIR AND SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)	93,102	93,102
148	CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC)	58,313	58,313
149	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	239,755	229,755
	Contract award and schedule delays for Block 40/45 EMD and DRAGON		−10,000
151	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	67,532	67,532
153	COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES	3,310	3,310
154	THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT (TBM) C4I	15,170	15,170
155	FIGHTER TACTICAL DATA LINK	85,492	23,992
	MADL—Transfer to line 134		−61,500
157	C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK	1,584	1,584
158	COMMAND AND CONTROL (C2) CONSTELLATION	24,229	24,229
159	JOINT SURVEILLANCE AND TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM	168,917	168,917

R–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
160	SEEK EAGLE	19,263	19,263
161	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	21,638	21,638
162	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	6,020	6,020
163	DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES	2,863	2,863
164	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	79,112	79,112
165	INFORMATION WARFARE SUPPORT	2,294	2,294
166	CYBER COMMAND ACTIVITIES	1,117	1,117
173	SPACE SUPERIORITY INTELLIGENCE	10,006	10,006
174	E–4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	12,532	12,532
175	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK	78,784	68,984
	MMPU Production—Air Force requested transfer to MP,AF line 9		−9,800
176	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	140,017	140,017
177	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	3,393	3,393
178	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	3,055	5,212
	Air Force requested transfer from line 179		+2,157
179	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	2,157	0
	Air Force requested transfer to line 178		−2,157
180	MILSATCOM TERMINALS	186,582	306,282
	FAB–T—Air Force requested transfer from AP,AF line 75		+119,700
182	AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE	149,268	144,268
	Program execution		−5,000
185	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	5,708	5,708
186	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	2,030	2,030
187	DOD CYBER CRIME CENTER	279	279
188	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	21,667	21,667
189	WEATHER SERVICE	32,373	32,373
190	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, & LANDING SYSTEM (ATC)	33,268	33,268
191	AERIAL TARGETS	63,573	58,573
	Program execution		−5,000
194	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	469	469
196	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	40	40
198	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT)	165,936	165,936
199	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE AND CONTROL)	34,471	34,471
201	SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER	4,572	4,572
202	SPACE WARFARE CENTER	2,929	2,929
203	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	9,933	9,933
204	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS	1,254	1,254
206	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	168,963	90,263
	Wide Area Airborne Surveillance Program of Record—ahead of need		−78,700
207	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	15,337	15,337
208	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	93,398	85,898
	Program Reduction		−7,500
209	PREDATOR UAV (JMIP)	28,913	23,913
	Program execution		−5,000
210	RQ4 UAV	251,318	220,318
	Execution adjustment		−31,000
211	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGET (TIARA)	7,267	7,267
212	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	828,171	446,304
	Operational Control Segment (OCX)—Transfer to line 33		−381,867
213	JSPOC MISSION SYSTEM	132,706	109,506
	JSPOC Mission System		−28,000
	Karnac		+4,800
214	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION WARFARE	5,512	5,512
215	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	72,199	72,199
216	NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE OFFICE	10,630	0
	Program termination—Funding transferred to Executive Agent for Space, OM,AF		−10,630
217	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS	43,838	43,838
218	INFORMATION OPS TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION & TOOL DEVELOP	21,912	21,912
219	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	2,952	2,952
220	C–130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON	113,107	43,472
	Air Force requested transfer to AP,AF line 61		−69,635
221	C–5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS	58,990	58,990
222	C–17 AIRCRAFT	177,212	162,212
	Contract award delays		−15,000
223	C–130J PROGRAM	26,770	26,770
224	LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM)	17,227	17,227
225	KC–135S	20,453	20,453
226	KC–10S	56,669	41,669
	Milestone B slip		−15,000
227	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT	4,988	4,988
228	C–STOL AIRCRAFT	1,283	1,283
230	SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL	7,345	7,345
231	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,514	1,514
234	LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT)	227,614	227,614
235	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	6,141	38,141
	Alternative energy research and integration		+32,000
235A	AIR FORCE RECRUITING INFORMATION SUPPORT SYSTEM	0	5,100
	Air Force Recruiting Information Support System—Air Force requested transfer from OM,AF		+5,100
236	OTHER FLIGHT TRAINING	667	667
237	JOINT NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER	9	9
239	OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES	116	116
240	JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY	6,107	6,107
242	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	7,811	7,811
243	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	11,179	11,179
244	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	49,816	49,816
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	12,406,781	12,915,571
	Classified Adjustment		+508,790
	TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE	27,247,302	26,517,405
	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE		
1	DTRA UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BASIC RESEARCH	47,412	47,412
2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	328,195	295,695
	Excessive growth		−32,500
5	NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM	109,911	94,311
	Unexecutable growth		−15,600
6	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	49,508	49,508
7	INSENSITIVE MUNITIONS—EXPLORATORY DEVELOPMENT	22,448	20,448
	Excessive growth		−2,000
8	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES & UNIV (HBCU) SCIENCE	15,067	23,067
	Program Increase		+8,000
9	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	32,830	32,830
10	INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	281,262	253,262
	DISCOVER contract award delays		−10,000
	Extreme Computing contract award delays		−18,000
11	COGNITIVE COMPUTING SYSTEMS	90,143	90,143
12	MACHINE INTELLIGENCE	44,682	44,682
13	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	32,692	32,692
14	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	169,287	174,287
	TMTI BA 5 unexecutable funding transferred back to S&T at request of the Department		+5,000
15	JOINT DATA MANAGEMENT ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	3,261	0
	Duplicate effort		−3,261
16	CYBER SECURITY RESEARCH	10,000	5,000
	Lack of authorization		−5,000

R–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
17	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) APP	9,499	7,999
	Excessive growth		−1,500
18	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	224,378	224,378
19	MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY	312,586	307,586
	Unsustained growth		−5,000
20	ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	286,936	266,936
	Excessive growth		−20,000
21	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT TECHNOLOGIES	212,742	212,742
22	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	26,545	36,745
	Program Increase—Unfunded Requirement		+15,200
	Unexecutable growth		−5,000
24	JOINT MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECH INSENSITIVE MUNITIONS AD	20,556	15,556
	Unjustified growth		−5,000
25	SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	44,423	44,423
26	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	85,299	85,299
27	COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES—PROLIF PREV & DEFEAT	295,163	295,163
28	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY	132,220	92,220
	SM–3 Block IIB Development transfer to line 84, AEGIS BMD		−40,000
29	JOINT ADVANCED CONCEPTS	6,808	6,808
30	JOINT DOD–DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	22,700	22,700
31	AGILE TRANSPO FOR THE 21ST CENTURY (AT21)—THEATER CA	750	750
32	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	303,078	241,378
	ArcLight		−5,000
	ISIS lack of transition partner		−21,700
	MoTr program delays		−15,000
	Vulture program descope and delays		−20,000
33	SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY	98,130	98,130
34	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	177,113	222,713
	TMTI BA 5 unexecutable funding transferred back to S&T at request of the Department		+45,600
35	JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	8,386	8,386
36	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	206,917	191,917
	Unjustified growth		−15,000
37	NETWORKED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES	30,035	25,035
	Unjustified growth		−5,000
38	JOINT DATA MANAGEMENT RESEARCH	6,289	4,289
	Excessive growth		−2,000
39	BIOMETRICS SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	11,416	11,416
40	CYBER SECURITY ADVANCED RESEARCH	10,000	5,000
	Lack of authorization		−5,000
41	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) ADV	11,510	10,510
	Excessive growth		−1,000
42	DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROG	18,916	42,916
	Industrial Base Innovation Fund		+24,000
43	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM/AUTONOMOUS SYSTEMS	9,943	9,943
44	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	20,542	20,542
45	DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY	29,109	29,109
46	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	68,021	64,021
	Unexecutable growth		−4,000
47	MICROELECTRONIC TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT	26,878	26,878
48	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	10,966	10,966
49	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	197,098	197,098
52	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	200,986	240,986
	Program adjustment		+40,000
53	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	219,809	219,809
54	CLASSIFIED DARPA PROGRAMS	167,008	150,308
	Poor justification materials		−16,700
55	NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	234,985	227,985
	Unsustained growth		−7,000
56	SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	205,032	205,032
58	DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	13,986	13,986
59	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	30,910	30,910
61	QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	78,244	58,244
	Excessive growth		−13,000
	P826—Excess to Quick Reaction Fund requirements		−7,000
62	JOINT EXPERIMENTATION	111,946	91,946
	Excessive growth		−20,000
63	MODELING AND SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	38,140	33,140
	Unexecutable growth		−5,000
64	DIRECTED ENERGY RESEARCH	98,688	123,688
	Program Increase		+25,000
65	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	97,642	97,642
66	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	23,310	17,310
	Unjustified growth		6,000
67	SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	30,806	38,806
	SOF ACTD Programs		+8,000
68	AVIATION ENGINEERING ANALYSIS	4,234	4,234
69	SOF INFORMATION & BROADCAST SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOG	4,942	4,942
69X	INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	0	124,200
	Program adjustment		+124,200
70	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	32,132	32,132
71	RETRACT LARCH	21,592	21,592
72	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	9,878	9,878
73	ADVANCE SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	18,060	18,060
74	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	30,419	30,419
75	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT	436,482	431,482
	Funding no longer required for transition to Reagan Test Site		−5,000
76	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT	1,346,181	1,311,181
	Excess Award Fee and Test and Integration Delays		−35,000
78	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	277,062	271,062
	Improved Nerve Agent Treatment System—slow obligation rate in fiscal year 2010		−5,000
	Lightweight Chemical/Biological Ensemble execution delays		−1,000
79	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS	454,859	392,159
	Transfer to line 88 for Concurrent Test, Training and Operations		−35,900
	Transfer to line 88 for TPY–2 C2BMC Fielding		−13,000
	Transfer to line 88 for BMDS Radars Communications Sustainment (TPY–2)		−13,800
81	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST & TARGETS	1,113,425	1,008,525
	Transfer to lines 82 and 88		−94,900
	Funding no longer required for move to Reagan Test Site		−5,000
	Program Growth in Program Operations Systems Engineering and Systems Management		−5,000
82	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE ENABLING PROGRAMS	402,769	406,269
	Transfer from line 81		+43,500
	Excessive contractor support, advisory services and program growth		−40,000
83	SPECIAL PROGRAMS—MDA	270,189	245,189
	Transfer to higher priority near-term MDA procurement programs		−25,000
84	AEGIS BMD	1,467,278	1,569,278
	Program growth		−12,000
	Navy requested transfer from OP,N line 109		+72,500
	Aegis BMD Ships—Navy requested transfer from OM,N line 1B5B		+1,500
	SM–3 Block IIB Development—transfer from line 28		+40,000
85	SPACE SURVEILLANCE & TRACKING SYSTEM	112,678	112,678
87	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS	10,942	10,942
88	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE C2BMC	342,625	456,725
	Transfer from line 81 for Concurrent Test, Training and Operations		+51,400
	Transfer from line 79 for Concurrent Test, Training and Operations		+35,900

R–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
	Transfer from line 79 for TPY–2 C2BMC Fielding		+13,000
	Transfer from line 79 for BMDS Radar Communications Sustainment (TPY–2)		+13,800
90	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT WARFIGHTER SUPPORT	68,726	58,726
	Duplication of effort with MDA core programs		−10,000
91	CENTER (MDIOC)	86,198	86,198
92	REGARDING TRENCH	7,529	7,529
93	SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX)	153,056	153,056
98	ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	121,735	209,935
	David's Sling Weapons Program		+38,000
	Arrow System Improvement Program (ASIP)		+42,000
	Arrow 3 Upper Tier Interceptor Program		+8,200
99	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	14,735	14,735
100	COALITION WARFARE	13,786	13,786
101	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM	4,802	39,502
	Department of Defense Corrosion Prevention and Control Program		+34,700
102	DOD UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM (UAS) COMMON DEVELOPMENT	49,292	49,292
104	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) RES	7,459	7,459
105	JOINT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION COMMAND (JSIC)	19,413	19,413
106	JOINT FIRES INTEGRATION & INTEROPERABILITY TEAM	16,637	16,637
107	LAND-BASED SM–3 (LBSM3)	281,378	281,378
108	AEGIS SM–3 BLOCK IIA CO-DEVELOPMENT	318,800	318,800
109	PRECISION TRACKING SPACE SYSTEM RDT&E	66,969	36,969
	Transfer to higher priority near-term MDA procurement programs		−30,000
110	AIRBORNE INFRARED (ABIR)	111,671	76,671
	Transfer to higher priority near-term MDA procurement programs		−35,000
111	REDUCTION OF TOTAL OWNERSHIP COST	20,310	20,310
112	JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM	4,027	4,027
113	DEFENSE ACQUISITION CHALLENGE PROGRAM (DACP)	24,344	24,344
114	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	7,973	7,973
115	PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT	239,861	239,861
116	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	407,162	300,562
	Plague Vaccine—slow obligation rate in fiscal year 2010		−5,000
	TMTI BA 5 unexecutable funding transferred back to S&T at request of the Department		−65,600
	Bioscavenger Increment II schedule delays		−12,000
	Decontamination Family of Systems schedule delays		−9,000
	Next Generation Chemical Standoff Detection schedule delays		−9,000
	SSI NBCRS growth without acquisition strategy		−6,000
117	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	4,155	4,155
118	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITSJPO)	49,364	23,695
	Technology Initiatives Investment Fund		−25,669
119	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	20,954	20,954
120	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT CAPABILITIES	7,307	7,307
121	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	11,937	11,937
122	DEFENSE INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM	11,800	11,800
123	BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY R&D ACTIVITIES	184,131	181,166
	VIPS Increment II contract award in fiscal year 2012		−2,965
124	HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE	391	391
125	OUSD(C) IT DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES	5,000	5,000
126	TRUSTED FOUNDRY	35,512	35,512
128	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	17,842	17,842
130	WOUNDED ILL AND INJURED SENIOR OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE	1,590	1,590
132	DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS)	5,113	5,113
133	JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT	8,052	8,052
134	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT	162,286	162,286
135	ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS	2,500	2,500
136	THERMAL VICAR	8,851	8,851
137	JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC)	10,287	10,287
138	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	49,282	49,282
139	USD(A&T)—CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	4,743	4,743
140	FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	95,520	95,520
141	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	94,577	94,577
142	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P)	0	106,000
	Classified Program USD(P)		+106,000
143	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	32,755	27,755
	Unjustified growth		−5,000
144	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	29,824	37,024
	Sustainment of fiscal year 2010 level		+7,200
145	NUCLEAR MATTERS—PHYSICAL SECURITY	6,264	6,264
146	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION	15,091	15,091
147	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE)	6,227	6,227
147X	DEFENSE-WIDE ELECTRONIC PROCUREMENT	0	12,000
	Program Increase—contract management services program		+12,000
148	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	120,995	120,995
155	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH/CHALLENGE ADMINISTR	2,189	2,189
156	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	13,858	11,158
	P796—Technical Grand Challenge Program		−2,700
157	FORCE TRANSFORMATION DIRECTORATE	19,701	19,701
158	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC)	61,054	58,554
	Excessive growth		2,500
159	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING & EVALUATION	64,737	64,737
160	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	18,688	25,888
	Sustainment of fiscal year 2010 level		+7,200
161	DARPA AGENCY RELOCATION	11,000	11,000
162	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT)	56,257	56,257
163	BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	6,099	6,099
164	AVIATION SAFETY TECHNOLOGIES	10,900	10,900
165	JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT	23,081	8,081
	Growth without acquisition strategy		−15,000
168	SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES	31,500	31,500
169	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RAPID ACQUISITION	5,135	5,135
170	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	10,000	10,000
171	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO)	21,272	21,272
173	WARFIGHTING AND INTELLIGENCE-RELATED SUPPORT	845	845
174	COCOM EXERCISE ENGAGEMENT AND TRAINING TRANSFORMATION	92,253	48,688
	P 754—Initiatives funded by Services		−33,315
	P 764—NPSUE funding without program		−10,250
175	PENTAGON RESERVATION	20,482	20,482
176	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS—MDA	29,754	29,754
177	IT SOFTWARE DEV INITIATIVES	278	278
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	61,577	61,577
178	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM FOR SECURITY (DISS)	5,522	1,000
	Unjustified program		−4,522
179	REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH & PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE	2,139	2,139
180	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SHARED INFORMATION SYSTEM	290	290
181	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT)	6,634	6,634
183	JOINT INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY	44,139	44,139
185	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	2,288	2,288
186	C4I INTEROPERABILITY	74,023	74,023
188	JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING	9,379	9,379
195	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	467	467
196	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	16,629	36,629
	Cyber Security Pilot Programs		+20,000
197	LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS)	9,130	9,130
198	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK	9,529	9,529

R–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
199	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI)	8,881	8,881
200	KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI)	45,941	45,941
201	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	14,077	14,077
202	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	388,827	388,827
205	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	2,261	2,261
206	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	26,247	25,047
	Fiscal year 2012 testing		−1,200
207	JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER	20,991	20,991
208	NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	3,366	3,366
209	JOINT MILITARY DECEPTION INITIATIVE	1,161	1,161
210	TELEPORT PROGRAM	6,880	6,880
211	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES	16,272	16,272
214	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	501	501
216	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	2,251	2,251
217	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	10,486	10,486
221	POLICY R&D PROGRAMS	9,136	9,136
223	NET CENTRICITY	29,831	14,831
	Unjustified growth		−15,000
227	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	1,290	1,290
230	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	3,513	3,513
232	MQ–1 PREDATOR A UAV	98	98
234	HOMELAND DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM	2,988	2,988
235	INT'L INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT, ADVANCEMENT	1,416	1,416
245	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	21,798	21,798
246	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	2,813	2,813
247	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (JCS)	2,807	2,807
249	NATO AGS	93,885	93,885
250	MQ–9 UAV	98	98
252	SPECIAL OPERATIONS AVIATION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	68,691	68,691
253	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	1,582	1,582
254	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	23,879	25,479
	Program Increase—Unfunded Requirement		+1,600
255	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	62,592	63,692
	Program Increase—Unfunded Requirement		+4,000
	Program termination		−2,900
256	SPECIAL OPERATIONS CV–22 DEVELOPMENT	14,406	14,406
257	JOINT MULTI-MISSION SUBMERSIBLE	14,924	0
	SOCOM requested transfer to line 269		−14,924
259	MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS (MTPS)	2,915	2,915
261	MC130J SOF TANKER RECAPITALIZATION	7,624	7,624
262	SOF COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS SYSTEMS	1,922	922
	Execution delays		−1,000
263	SOF TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS	2,347	2,347
264	SOF WEAPONS SYSTEMS	479	479
265	SOF SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS	593	593
267	SOF TACTICAL VEHICLES	1,994	994
	Change in requirements		−1,000
268	SOF ROTARY WING AVIATION	14,473	33,715
	SOCOM requested transfer from P,DW line 57		+19,242
269	SOF UNDERWATER SYSTEMS	13,986	28,910
	SOCOM requested transfer from line 257		+14,924
270	SOF SURFACE CRAFT	2,933	18,933
	Program Increase—CCM Unfunded Requirement		+16,000
271	SOF PSYOP	4,193	4,193
272	SOF GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	5,135	5,135
273	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	9,167	9,167
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,832,019	4,011,571
	Classified adjustment		+179,552
	TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE	20,661,600	20,797,412
	OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE		
1	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	59,430	59,430
2	LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION	12,899	12,899
3	OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES	122,581	122,581
	TOTAL, OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE	194,910	194,910
	TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION	76,130,700	74,957,028

P–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
	NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND		
	STRATEGIC SHIP ACQUISITION	411,202	911,202
	Additional Mobile Landing Platform		500,000
	DoD MOBILIZATION ASSETS	158,647	158,647
	STRATEGIC SEALIFT SUPPORT	4,875	4,875
	SEALIFT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	28,012	28,012
	READY RESERVE FORCE OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE	332,130	332,130
	MARITIME ADMINISTRATION SHIP FINANCING GUARANTEE PROGRAM		40,000
	TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND	934,866	1,474,866
	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM		
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	29,915,277	29,671,764
	IN-HOUSE CARE	7,781,877	7,791,077
	131	2,800	−2,800
	Pain Management Task Force		+12,000
	PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	16,034,745	15,673,745
	TRICARE Underexecution		−236,000
	Global Deployment of the Force medical research funding—DOD requested transfer to maintain full funding for the program		125,000
	CONSOLIDATED HEALTH CARE	2,122,483	2,085,770
	131	27,825	−27,825
	Psychological Health—State Directors for the National Guard—Transfer to OM,ARNG line 133		−8,888
	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT/IT	1,452,330	1,452,330
	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS	293,698	288,698
	MHS Strategic Communications efficiencies		−5,000
	EDUCATION AND TRAINING	632,534	632,534
	BASE OPERATIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS	1,597,610	1,747,610
	Medical Facilities Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization		+150,000
	PROCUREMENT	519,921	534,921
	Procurement of Medical Equipment and IO&T Navy		+15,000
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	499,913	1,175,513
	ALS		+8,000
	Armed Forces Institute of Regenerative Medicine		+4,800
	Autism Research		+6,400
	Bone Marrow Failure Disease Research Program		+4,000
	Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy		+4,000
	Global HIV/AIDS Prevention		+10,000
	Traumatic Brain Injury and Psychological Health		+100,000
	Global Deployment of the Force medical research funding—Department of Defense requested transfer to maintain full funding for the program		+125,000
	Gulf War Illness Peer-Reviewed Research Program		+8,000
	Multiple Sclerosis		+4,800

P–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
	Peer-Reviewed Alzheimer Research		+15,000
	Peer-Reviewed Breast Cancer Research Program		+150,000
	Peer-Reviewed Cancer Research Program		+16,000
	Peer-Reviewed Lung Cancer Research Program		+12,800
	Peer-Reviewed Orthopedic Research Program		+24,000
	Peer-Reviewed Ovarian Cancer Research Program		+20,000
	Peer Reviewed Vision research in conjunction with the DoD Vision Center of Excellence		+4,000
	Peer-Reviewed Prostate Cancer Research Program		+80,000
	Peer-Reviewed Spinal Cord Research Program		+12,000
	Research in Alcohol and Substance Use Disorders		+5,200
	SBIR to the core funded RDT&E		+1,200
	Tuberous Sclerosis Complex (TSC)		+6,400
	Pain Management Task Force Research		+4,000
	Peer Reviewed Medical Research Program		+50,000
	TOTAL, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	30,935,111	31,382,198
	CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE		
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,067,364	1,067,364
	PROCUREMENT	7,132	7,132
	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION	392,811	392,811
	TOTAL, CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE	1,467,307	1,467,307
	DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTERDRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE		
PC129 3	Supplies and Materials (non-fund)—NSA		−1,000
PC132 9	Other Intra-Governmental Purchases—Navy		−2,500
PC650 1	Other Intra-Governmental Purchases—OSD		−2,000
PC920 6	Other Intra-Governmental Purchases—OSD		−4,000
PC9205	EUCOM Counternarcotics Operations Support excessive growth		−3,000
PC1293	International crime and narcotics analytic tools excessive growth		−1,000
PC2360	EUCOM Tactical Analysis Team Support unauthorized new Start		−1,500
	FFRDC cost growth and CN indicated no need		−11,394
	National Guard Counter-Drug Program-State Plans		+50,000
	Young Marines-Drug Demand Reduction		+2,000
	TOTAL, DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTERDRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	1,131,351	1,156,957
	JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND		
4	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE	215,868	0
	Transfer to Title IX		−215,868
	TOTAL, JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND	215,868	0
	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL		
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	282,354	305,794
	Program Increase		+23,440
	PROCUREMENT	1,000	1,000
	TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	283,354	306,794
	TOTAL, OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS	34,032,991	34,313,256

TITLE IX—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

For the Department of Defense overseas contingency operations budget, funds are to be available for fiscal year 2011, as follows:

P–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
	MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY		
	BA–1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS		
	BASIC PAY	1,237,779	1,237,779
	RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	313,278	313,278
	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	349,839	349,839
	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	44,752	44,752
	INCENTIVE PAYS	2,835	2,835
	SPECIAL PAYS	159,261	159,261
	ALLOWANCES	56,632	56,632
	SEPARATION PAY	1,303	1,303
	SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	94,650	94,650
	TOTAL, BA–1	2,260,329	2,260,329
	BA–2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
	BASIC PAY	2,708,271	2,708,271
	RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	693,325	693,325
	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	1,113,877	1,113,877
	INCENTIVE PAYS	6,714	6,714
	SPECIAL PAYS	574,120	574,120
	ALLOWANCES	241,921	241,921
	SEPARATION PAY	26,276	26,276
	SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	207,174	207,174
	TOTAL, BA–2	5,571,678	5,571,678
	BA–4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	329,046	329,046
	SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	1,871,805	1,871,805
	TOTAL, BA–4	2,200,851	2,200,851
	BA–5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL		
	ACCESSION TRAVEL	45,512	45,512
	OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	107,025	107,025
	ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	45,514	45,514
	TOTAL, BA–5	198,051	198,051
	BA–6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS		
	INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	16,102	16,102
	DEATH GRATUITIES	66,220	66,220
	UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	192,223	192,223
	RESERVE INCOME REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	1,895	1,895
	SGLI EXTRA HAZARD PAYMENTS	171,060	171,060
	TOTAL, BA–6	447,500	447,500
	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT		789,624
	Undistributed Transfer from Title I		+789,624
	TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY	10,678,409	11,468,033

P–1	Budget Request	Recommendation
MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY		
BA–1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS		
BASIC PAY	213,340	213,340
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	59,067	59,067
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	67,023	67,023
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	7,315	7,315
INCENTIVE PAYS	1,543	1,543
SPECIAL PAYS	16,667	16,667
ALLOWANCES	16,754	16,754
SEPARATION PAY	14	14
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	16,320	16,320
TOTAL, BA–1	398,043	398,043
BA–2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
BASIC PAY	262,656	262,656
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	74,338	74,338
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	121,913	121,913
INCENTIVE PAYS	325	325
SPECIAL PAYS	80,007	80,007
ALLOWANCES	27,692	27,692
SEPARATION PAY	3,535	3,535
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	20,093	20,093
TOTAL, BA-2	590,559	590,559
BA-4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	28,639	28,639
SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	14,546	14,546
TOTAL, BA–4	43,185	43,185
BA–5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL		
ACCESSION TRAVEL	5,214	5,214
OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	23,903	23,903
ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	30,110	30,110
SEPARATION TRAVEL	3,132	3,132
TOTAL, BA–5	62,359	62,359
BA–6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS		
DEATH GRATUITIES	3,800	3,800
UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	29,662	29,662
SGLI EXTRA HAZARD PAYMENTS	51,111	51,111
TOTAL, BA–6	84,573	84,573
UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT		130,000
Higher than Budgeted Mobilization Levels		+110,000
Increased Deployment Levels		+20,000
TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY	1,178,719	1,308,719
MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS		
BA–1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS		
BASIC PAY	40,079	40,079
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	13,308	13,308
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	18,565	18,565
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	1,760	1,760
SPECIAL PAYS	10,747	10,747
ALLOWANCES	4,805	4,805
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	4,176	4,176
TOTAL, BA–1	93,440	93,440
BA–2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
BASIC PAY	190,013	190,013
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	43,090	43,090
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	45,977	45,977
SPECIAL PAYS	95,395	95,395
ALLOWANCES	40,431	40,431
SEPARATION PAY	3,017	3,017
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	13,435	13,435
TOTAL, BA–2	431,358	431,358
BA–4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	21,420	21,420
TOTAL, BA–4	21,420	21,420
BA–5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL		
ACCESSION TRAVEL	3,270	3,270
TOTAL, BA–5	3,270	3,270
BA–6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS		
DEATH GRATUITIES	27,000	27,000
UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	19,942	19,942
SGLI EXTRA HAZARD PAYMENTS	48,345	48,345
TOTAL, BA–6	95,287	95,287
UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT		88,145
Over Budgeted End Strength		+88,145
TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS	644,775	732,920
MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE		
BA—1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS		
BASIC PAY	188,334	188,334
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	45,953	45,953
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	58,889	58,889
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	7,320	7,320
SPECIAL PAYS	13,613	13,613
ALLOWANCES	5,760	5,760
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	14,408	14,408
TOTAL, BA–1	334,277	334,277
BA–2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
BASIC PAY	472,896	472,896
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	115,387	115,387
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	177,545	177,545
SPECIAL PAYS	49,964	49,964
ALLOWANCES	16,254	16,254
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	36,177	36,177
TOTAL, BA–2	868,223	868,223
BA–4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	39,090	39,090
SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	61,805	61,805
TOTAL, BA–4	100,895	100,895
BA–5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL		
OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	5,957	5,957
TOTAL, BA–5	5,957	5,957

P–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
	BA–6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS		
	DEATH GRATUITIES	2,000	2,000
	UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	27,978	27,978
	SGLI EXTRA HAZARD PAYMENTS	67,057	67,057
	TOTAL, BA–6	97,035	97,035
	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT		654,055
	Higher than Budgeted Mobilization Levels		+378,000
	Over Budgeted End Strength		+276,055
	TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	1,406,387	2,060,442
	RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY		
	BA–1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING		
	PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS and DRILLS 24/48)	104,230	104,230
	SCHOOL TRAINING	9,886	9,886
	SPECIAL TRAINING	153,915	153,915
	TOTAL, BA–1	268,031	268,031
	TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY	268,031	268,031
	RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY		
	BA–1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING		
	SCHOOL TRAINING	7,019	7,019
	SPECIAL TRAINING	38,683	38,683
	ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	3,210	3,210
	TOTAL, BA–1	48,912	48,912
	TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY	48,912	48,912
	RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS		
	BA–1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING		
	SCHOOL TRAINING	5,467	5,467
	SPECIAL TRAINING	24,797	24,797
	ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	373	373
	TOTAL, BA–1	30,637	30,637
	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT		14,800
	Over Budgeted End Strength		+14,800
	TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS	30,637	45,437
	RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE		
	BA–1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING		
	SPECIAL TRAINING	27,002	27,002
	TOTAL, BA–1	27,002	27,002
	TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	27,002	27,002
	NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY		
	BA–1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING		
	PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS and DRILLS 24/48)	231,547	231,547
	SPECIAL TRAINING	550,090	550,090
	ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	46,485	46,485
	TOTAL, BA–1	828,122	828,122
	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT		24,900
	Support to Southwest Border		+24,900
	TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY	828,122	853,022
	NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE		
	BA–1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING		
	SPECIAL TRAINING	21,060	11,060
	Excess to Need		−10,000
	TOTAL, BA–1	21,060	11,060
	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT		5,800
	Support to Southwest Border		+5,800
	TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	21,060	16,860
	TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL	15,132,054	16,829,378

0–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY		
131	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	0	1,000,000
	Increased Peacetime Base Operations Support Costs to Redeployment of Soldiers from Iraq		+1,000,000
135	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	47,638,208	44,608,615
	Reduced Deployment Level		−2,500,000
	Transfer to SAG 421 for Subsistence Transportation Costs		−1,013,000
	Transfer from Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund for Detainee Operations		+80,000
	Transfer from JIEDDO—Synchronization and Integration WTI Cell		+3,200
	Transfer from JIEDDO—Thermal Station (National IED Exploitation Facility (NIEF))		+13,000
	Transfer from JIEDDO—Beachcomber		+3,000
	Transfer from JIEDDO—Counter Bomber		+1,500
	Transfer from JIEDDO—CREW-SSM Universal Test Set		+3,000
	Transfer from JIEDDO—Subtle Magnetic Anomaly Detection Network Systems		+1,000
	Transfer from JIEDDO—Technical Collection Training Program		+16,400
	Transfer from Title II—Chemical Defense Equipment Sustainment		+8,579
	Transfer from Title II—MRAP Vehicle Sustainment at Combat Training Centers		+6,420
	Transfer from Title II—Body Armor Sustainment		+71,660
	Transfer from Title II—Rapid Equipping Force Readiness		+9,294
	Transfer from Title II—Fixed Wing Life Cycle Contract Support		+21,171
	Transfer from Title II—Overseas Security Guards		+200,000
	Transfer from Title II—Senior Leader Initiative—Comprehensive Soldier Fitness Program		+30,000
	Transfer from Title II—Survivability and Maneuverability Training		+15,183
136	COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM	1,300,000	500,000
	Program reduction		−400,000
	Transfer to Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund		−400,000
137	RESET	7,840,211	6,261,568
	Army-Identified Excess Reset Requirement		−1,578,643
411	SECURITY PROGRAMS	2,358,865	2,364,265
	Transfer from JIEDDO—Air Vigilance		+5,400
421	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	3,465,334	4,478,334
	Transfer from SAG 135 for Subsistence Transportation Costs		+1,013,000
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY	62,602,618	59,212,782
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY		
1A1A	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	1,839,918	1,839,918
1A2A	FLEET AIR TRAINING	3,453	3,453

0–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
1A3A	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SVCS	1,400	1,400
1A4A	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	26,837	26,837
1A4N	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	44,567	44,567
1A5A	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	233,114	281,114
	Aircraft Depot Maintenance Increase		+48,000
1B1B	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	1,151,465	1,151,465
1B2B	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	27,472	27,472
1B4B	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,266,556	1,290,556
	Ship Depot Maintenance Increase		+24,000
1C1C	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	38,468	38,468
1C4C	WARFARE TACTICS	82,801	32,801
	Navy Identified Excess to Requirement for CENTCOM Operations		−50,000
1C5C	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	24,855	24,855
1C6C	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	2,737,727	2,930,528
	Transfer from Title II—Naval Expeditionary Combat Command Increases		+192,801
1C7C	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	3,677	3,677
1CCH	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	7,000	7,000
1CCM	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	7,455	7,455
1D3D	INSERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	99,118	100,118
	Transfer from JIEDDO—CREW-SSM Universal Test Set		+1,000
1D4D	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	82,519	82,519
1D7D	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	16,938	16,938
BSIT	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	10,350	0
	ONE-NET Baseline Budget Requirement		−10,350
BSM1	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	28,250	49,250
	Continuing Operations at Guantanamo Bay—Transfer from Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund		+21,000
BSS1	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	381,749	436,249
	Continuing Operations at Guantanamo Bay—Transfer from Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund		+4,000
	Transfer from JIEDDO—Counter Bomber		+500
	Transfer from Title II—Regional/Emergency Operations Center		+50,000
2A1F	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	27,300	27,300
2C1H	FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM	4,400	4,400
2C3H	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	254,461	0
	Transfer to Department of Homeland Security		−254,461
3B1K	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	81,454	84,454
	Transfer from Title II—NAVSEA VSSS/EOD Training		+3,000
3B4K	TRAINING SUPPORT	5,400	0
	Training Support Baseline Budget Requirement		−5,400
4A1M	ADMINISTRATION	4,265	4,265
4A2M	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	467	467
4A3M	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	450	450
4A4M	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	11,214	11,214
4A5M	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	2,706	2,706
4A6M	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	28,671	28,671
4B1N	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	300,868	300,868
4B3N	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	6,091	6,091
4B7N	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	2,153	2,153
4C1P	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	78,464	78,464
9999	OTHER PROGRAMS	22,581	22,581
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY	8,946,634	8,970,724
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS		
1A1A	OPERATIONAL FORCES	2,448,572	2,317,572
	Excess to Requirement for Cargo UAS		−90,400
	Transfer to RDTE,N for Cargo UAS		−36,000
	Transfer to OP,N for AM-2 Matting		−4,600
1A2A	FIELD LOGISTICS	514,748	517,248
	Transfer from JIEDDO—Counter Bomber		+1,000
	Transfer from JIEDDO—CREW-SSM Universal Test Set		+1,000
	Transfer from JIEDDO—Subtle Magnetic Anomaly Detection Network Systems		+500
1A3A	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	523,250	523,250
1B1B	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	7,808	7,808
BSS1	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	55,301	55,301
3B4D	TRAINING SUPPORT	223,071	223,071
4A3G	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	360,000	360,000
4A4G	ADMINISTRATION	3,772	3,772
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	4,136,522	4,008,022
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE		
011A	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,896,647	1,896,647
011C	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	1,954,759	1,954,759
011D	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING	113,948	113,948
011M	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	297,623	399,983
	Weapons System Sustainment		+102,360
011R	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	704,463	504,463
	Unjustified Growth from fiscal year 2010 Baseline		−200,000
011Z	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	1,780,052	1,780,052
012A	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	128,632	128,632
012C	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	397,894	397,894
013A	LAUNCH FACILITIES	28,975	28,975
013C	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	34,091	34,091
015A	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	127,861	127,861
021A	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	4,403,800	4,403,800
021D	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	240,394	240,394
021M	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	217,023	217,023
021R	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	20,360	20,360
021Z	BASE SUPPORT	57,362	57,362
031R	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,948	1,948
031Z	BASE SUPPORT	6,088	6,088
032A	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	45,893	45,893
032B	FLIGHT TRAINING	20,277	20,277
032C	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	1,500	1,500
032D	TRAINING SUPPORT	1,820	1,820
041A	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	292,030	292,030
041R	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	10,500	10,500
041Z	BASE SUPPORT	31,985	31,985
042A	ADMINISTRATION	5,438	5,438
042B	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	247,149	247,149
042G	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	113,082	113,082
043A	SECURITY PROGRAMS	305,689	305,689
	REDUCED DEPLOYMENT LEVELS		−400,000
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	13,487,283	12,989,643
	OPERATION AND MAINTENCE, DEFENSE-WIDE		
1PL1	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	20,500	20,500
1PL2	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	3,012,026	2,903,126
	Information Operations		−49,400
	Leased Aircraft—Unjustified Request		−65,500
	Transfer from JIEDDO—Wolfhound II		+6,000
ES18	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	14,799	14,799
4GT6	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	27,000	27,000

0–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
4GT9	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	136,316	144,316
	Increase Afghanistan FOB Fiber Connectivity		+8,000
4GTJ	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	74,862	74,862
4GTA	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	120,469	116,969
	Overstatement of Habeas Corpus Civilian Personnel Pricing		−3,500
4GTJ	DEFENSE DEPENDENTS EDUCATION	485,769	501,769
	Additional Funding for Outreach and Reintegration Services Under the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program		+16,000
4GTD	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	2,000,000	2,000,000
4GTI	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	1,218	1,218
4GTN	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	188,099	173,099
	Knowledge Management		−15,000
9999	OTHER PROGRAMS	3,345,300	3,299,332
	Classified Adjustments		−49,168
	Transfer from JIEDDO—Synchronization and Integration WTI Cell		+3,200
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	9,426,358	9,276,990
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE		
135	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	286,950	206,784
	Army Reserve Identified Excess to Requirement		−80,166
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	286,950	206,784
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE		
1A1A	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	49,089	49,089
1A3A	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	400	400
1A5A	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	17,760	17,760
1B1B	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	9,395	9,395
1B4B	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	497	497
1C1C	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	3,185	3,185
1C6C	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	12,169	12,169
4A4M	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	1,064	1,064
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	93,559	93,559
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE		
1A1A	OPERATING FORCES	23,571	23,571
BSS1	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	6,114	6,114
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	29,685	29,685
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE		
011M	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	116,924	191,124
	Weapons System Sustainment		+74,200
011Z	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	12,683	12,683
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE	129,607	203,807
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
135	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	544,349	497,849
	Distance Learning Transfer to Baseline OM,ARNG SAG 121		−9,000
	Air OPTEMPO Duplicate Request		−44,000
	Support to Southwest Border		+6,500
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	544,349	497,849
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
011F	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	152,896	152,896
011G	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	57,800	59,400
	Support to Southwest Border		+1,600
011M	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	140,127	205,687
	Weapons System Sustainment		+65,560
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	350,823	417,983
	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND		
	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND	1,551,781	0
	Transfer to OM,A SAG 135		−80,000
	Transfer to OM,N SAGs BSS1 and BSM1		−25,000
	Unjustified Program Change		−1,446,781
	TOTAL, OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER ACCOUNT	1,551,781	0
	AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND		
	Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund—Transfer from CERP		+400,000
	TOTAL, AFGHANISTAN INFRASTUCTURE FUND	0	400,000
	AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND		
	Afghan National Army	7,467,014	7,467,014
	Infrastructure	1,790,933	1,790,933
	Equipment and Transportation	1,846,623	1,846,623
	Training and Operations	836,842	836,842
	Sustainment	2,992,616	2,992,616
	Afghan National Police	4,085,437	4,085,437
	Infrastructure	1,078,413	1,078,413
	Equipment and Transportation	917,966	917,966
	Training and Operations	990,213	990,213
	Sustainment	1,098,845	1,098,845
	Related Activities	66,832	66,832
	Detainee Operations—Sustainment	6,037	6,037
	Detainee Operations—Training and Operations	1,530	1,530
	Detainee Operations—Infrastructure	58,265	58,265
	COIN Activities	1,000	1,000
	TOTAL, AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND	11,619,283	11,619,283
	IRAQ SECURITY FORCES FUND		
	Defense Security Forces	1,656,906	1,656,906
	Equipment and Transportation	1,067,706	1,067,706
	Training	248,075	248,075
	Sustainment	341,125	341,125
	Interior Security Forces	268,094	268,094
	Equipment and Transportation	220,469	220,469
	Sustainment	47,625	47,625
	Related Activities	75,000	75,000
	Authorization Reduction		−500,000
	TOTAL, IRAQ SECURITY FORCES FUND	2,000,000	1,500,000
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	115,205,452	109,427,111

P–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
2	C–12 CARGO AIRPLANE (OCO)	78,060	78,060
4	MQ–1 UAV (OCO)	47,000	24,000
	Reduction to Projected Battle Losses		−23,000
5	RQ–11 (RAVEN) (OCO)	17,430	17,430
9	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK III		34,600
	War Replacement Aircraft		+34,600
11	UH–60 BLACKHAWK (OCO)	40,500	373,400
	Program Increase for Army National Guard		+80,000
	Three Combat Loss UH–60		+52,500
	Accelerate 12 Aircraft		+200,400
13	CH–47 HELICOPTER (OCO)	70,600	258,400
	Accelerate Six Aircraft		+187,800
16	C12 AIRCRAFT MODS (OCO)	122,340	122,340
17	MQ–1 PAYLOAD UAS (OCO)	3,600	3,600
19	GUARDRAIL MODS (MIP) (OCO)	30,200	6,000
	Authorization Adjustment		−24,200
20	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP) (OCO)	86,200	86,200
21	AH–64 MODS (OCO)	199,200	654,200
	AH–64A to AH–64D Conversion for the Texas and Mississippi National Guard		+455,000
23	CH–47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (OCO)	82,900	66,900
	Cargo On/Off Loading System (COOLS) ahead of need		−16,000
27	UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS (OCO)	14,530	14,530
28	KIOWA WARRIOR (OCO)	187,288	160,378
	Fielded Fleet Upgrades		+20,000
	Limit Ramp Rate on Replacement Aircraft		46,910
29	AIRBORNE AVIONICS (OCO)	24,983	24,983
31	RQ–7 UAV MODS (OCO)	97,800	546,500
	Funding Ahead of Need		−1,000
	Transfer from Title III		+497,500
	Ahead of Need		−47,800
36	ASE INFRARED CM (OCO)	197,990	182,990
	Excess to Need		−15,000
38	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT (OCO)	65,627	65,627
40	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL (OCO)	7,555	0
	Unjustified Request		−7,555
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	1,373,803	2,720,138
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
4	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY (OCO)	190,459	190,459
6	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY (OCO)	112,769	112,769
13	ITAS/TOW MODS (OCO)	40,600	40,600
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	343,828	343,828
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY		
4	STRYKER VEHICLE (OCO)		545,000
	Transfer from Stryker Modifications, line 9		+445,000
	Increase for Stryker Double V Hull		+100,000
9	STRYKER VEHICLE MODS (OCO)	445,000	0
	Transfer to Stryker Vehicle, line 4		−445,000
22	MACHINE GUN, CAL .50, M2 ROLL		79,496
	Transfer from Title III		+79,496
26	MORTAR SYSTEMS (OCO)	8,600	8,600
28	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (OCO) COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION	22,500	22,500
32	(OCO)	100,000	100,000
34	HOWITZER LT WT 155MM (T) (OCO)	62,000	62,000
36	M4 CARBINE MODS (OCO)	12,900	42,900
	Program Increase		+30,000
37	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS (OCO)	15,000	15,000
40	M119 MODIFICATIONS (OCO)	21,500	21,500
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	687,500	896,996
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		
2	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES (OCO)	32,604	13,000
	Per Army Request		−19,604
4	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES (OCO)	128,876	47,000
	Per Army Request		−81,876
5	CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES (OCO)	20,056	10,500
	Per Army Request		−9,556
7	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES (OCO)	23,826	9,500
	Per Army Request		−14,326
8	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES (OCO)	62,700	25,000
	Per Army Request		−37,700
11	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES (OCO)	120,160	26,900
	APMI Unit Cost Savings		−50,100
	Per Army Request		−43,160
15	CTG, ARTY, 105MM: ALL TYPES (OCO)	37,620	15,000
	Per Army Request		−22,620
16	CTG, ARTY, 155MM: ALL TYPES (OCO)	37,620	15,000
	Per Army Request		−22,620
18	MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYS, ALL TYPES (OCO)	15,048	6,000
	Per Army Request		−9,048
19	ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES (OCO)	12,540	5,000
	Per Army Request		−7,540
24	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES (OCO)	17,556	0
	Per Army Request		−17,556
25	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES (OCO)	139,285	139,285
26	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES (OCO)		20,000
	Per Army Request		+20,000
27	GRENADES, ALL TYPES (OCO)	2,000	0
	Per Army Request		−2,000
31	NONLETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES (OCO)	15,000	0
	Per Army Request		−15,000
40	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION, ALL TYPES (OCO)	37,700	37,700
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	702,591	369,885
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
5	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV) (OCO)	516,350	398,925
	Battle Loss Replacement		+8,875
	Contract Savings		−126,300
7	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (OCO)	188,677	199,809
	Battle Loss Replacement		+11,132
9	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV) (OCO)	52,780	52,780
10	MINE PROTECTION VEHICLE FAMILY (OCO)	136,700	367,678
	Transfer from Title III		+230,978
14	HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM (OCO)	989,067	989,067
15	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP (OCO)	20,000	312,956
	Transfer from Title III		+292,956
24	WIN–T-GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK (OCO)	8,163	8,163

P–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
27	SHF TERM (OCO)	62,415	62,415
29	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (OCO)	13,500	63,500
.....	Additional DAGRs	.....	+50,000
40	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS—OPA2 (OCO)	3,946	3,946
47	RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY (OCO)	78,253	78,253
48	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (OCO)	15,000	15,000
51x	FAMILY OF BIOMETRICS	.....	38,172
.....	Non-MIP Biometrics—Transfer from RDTE,A line 171	.....	+38,172
53	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS (OCO)	70,000	47,500
.....	Excess to Need	.....	−22,500
55	INFORMATION SYSTEMS (OCO)	.....	55,000
.....	Program Adjustment for Tactical Local Area Network (TACLAN)	.....	+55,000
57	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD (OCO)	413,200	413,200
65	PROPHET GROUND (OCO)	18,900	18,900
70	DCGS–A (MIP) (OCO)	197,092	334,516
.....	Transfer from Title III	.....	+137,424
74	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL (OCO)	52,277	47,377
.....	Excess to Need	.....	−4,900
75	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MIP) (OCO)	5,400	5,400
76	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR (OCO)	25,000	10,000
.....	Program Decrease	.....	−15,000
77	WARLOCK (OCO)	225,682	225,682
79	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES (OCO)	455,639	455,639
81	FAAD GBS (OCO)	167,460	167,460
84	NIGHT VISION DEVICES (OCO)	5,019	5,019
89	COUNTER-ROCKET, ARTILLERY & MORTAR (C–RAM) (OCO)	291,400	251,200
.....	Funded Ahead of Need	.....	−40,200
90	BASE EXPEDITIONARY TARGETING & SURV SYS (OCO)	486,050	408,050
.....	Program Decrease	.....	−78,000
95	MOD OF IN–SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS) (OCO)	69,800	69,800
96	FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (OCO)	135,500	135,500
98	LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER	22,371	22,371
99	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32 (OCO)	1,800	1,800
101	COUNTERFIRE RADARS (OCO)	20,000	285,867
.....	Transfer from Title III	.....	+275,867
.....	Funded Ahead of Need	.....	−10,000
103	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS (OCO)	43,800	43,800
104	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY (OCO)	566	13,566
.....	Advanced Field Artillery Tactical Data System	.....	+13,000
105	BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYS	420	420
108	KNIGHT FAMILY (OCO)	49,744	49,744
110	AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY (OCO)	2,222	2,222
114	NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION & SERVICE (OCO)	5,000	5,000
115	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (OCO)	60,111	60,111
121	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP (OCO)	10,500	10,500
130	PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS (OCO)	5,690	5,690
135	TACTICAL BRIDGING, FLOAT RIBBON (OCO)	3,220	3,220
136	HANDHELD STANDOFF MINEFIELD DETECTION SYSTEM	0	28,000
.....	Transfer from JIEDDO for Proper Execution	.....	+28,000
137	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM (OCO)	191,000	191,000
141	HEATERS AND ECU'S (OCO)	8,708	8,708
149	FORCE PROVIDER (OCO)	261,599	52,499
.....	Excess to Need	.....	−209,100
150	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT (OCO)	29,903	29,903
154	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER (OCO)	55,105	55,105
155	WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS (OCO)	12,086	0
.....	Funded Ahead of Need	.....	−12,086
156	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL (OCO)	8,680	8,680
157	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS (OCO)	41,398	41,398
159	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE) (OCO)	3,390	3,390
161	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING (OCO)	3,195	3,195
164	LOADERS (OCO)	1,157	1,157
168	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR FOS (OCO)	3,750	3,750
170	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP) (OCO)	4,140	4,140
174	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP (OCO)	37,480	37,480
175	ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (OCO)	4,562	4,562
177	ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM (OCO)	56,609	58,049
.....	Battle Loss Replacement	.....	+1,440
179	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM (OCO)	28,624	28,624
180	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER (OCO)	8,200	0
.....	Funded Ahead of Need	.....	−8,200
184	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (OCO)	622	622
186	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPT EQUIPMENT (OCO)	58,590	38,590
.....	Excess to Need	.....	−20,000
187	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3) (OCO)	77,000	77,000
192	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING (OCO)	1,987	1,987
.....	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS (OCO)	775	775
.....	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	5,827,274	6,423,832
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
3	F/A–18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP)	.....	495,000
.....	Strike Fighter Shortfall Mitigation—Nine Aircraft	.....	+495,000
11	UH–1Y/AH1Z (OCO)	88,500	88,500
19	E–2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP)	.....	175,000
.....	Program Increase—Combat Loss Replacement	.....	+175,000
29	EA–6 SERIES (OCO)	15,000	12,700
.....	Install Equipment Program Adjustment	.....	−2,300
31	AV–8 SERIES (OCO)	72,100	65,371
.....	Pod Upgrade Kits Cost Growth	.....	−1,529
.....	GEN4 Pod Cost Growth	.....	−5,200
32	F–18 SERIES (OCO)	43,250	43,250
34	AH–1W SERIES (OCO)	35,510	35,510
35	H–53 SERIES (OCO)	36,248	27,148
.....	Funded Ahead of Need	.....	−9,100
36	SH–60 SERIES (OCO)	6,430	6,430
39	P–3 SERIES (OCO)	6,000	6,000
48	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT (OCO)	6,100	6,100
53	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT (OCO)	38,700	31,020
.....	Directed Infrared Countermeasures Installation Kit Cost Growth	.....	−7,680
54	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES (OCO)	14,100	14,100
55	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM (OCO)	10,500	10,500
57	RQ–7 SERIES (OCO)	8,000	8,000
58	V–22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY (OCO)	36,420	36,420
59	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (OCO)	3,500	208,500
.....	Aviation Spares	.....	+205,000
.....	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	420,358	1,269,549
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
5	SIDEWINDER (OCO)	2,923	0
.....	Non-combat Expenditures	.....	−2,923
9	HELLFIRE (OCO)	85,504	85,504
26	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS (OCO)	4,998	4,998

P–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
.....	TOTAL, WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	93,425	90,502
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS		
1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS (OCO)	6,060	0
.....	Contract Delay	.....	−6,060
3	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES (OCO)	76,043	76,043
4	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION (OCO)	69,660	68,660
.....	20mm Linked TP, PGU–27 Cost Growth	.....	−1,000
7	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES (OCO)	33,632	33,632
11	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION (OCO)	455	455
12	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO (OCO)	7,757	7,757
13	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION (OCO)	1,209	1,209
15	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION (OCO)	19,498	19,498
16	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES (OCO)	4,677	4,677
17	40 MM, ALL TYPES (OCO)	11,307	11,307
18	60MM, ALL TYPES (OCO)	17,150	17,150
19	81MM, ALL TYPES (OCO)	27,738	27,738
20	120MM, ALL TYPES (OCO)	96,895	96,895
21	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES (OCO)	990	990
22	GRENADES, ALL TYPES (OCO)	6,137	6,137
23	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES (OCO)	13,543	13,543
24	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES (OCO)	137,118	137,118
25	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES (OCO)	9,296	9,296
26	FUZE, ALL TYPES (OCO)	25,888	25,888
27	NON LETHALS (OCO)	31	31
.....	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS	565,084	558,024
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
25	STANDARD BOATS (OCO)	30,706	23,706
.....	Riverine Patrol Boats—Unjustified Request	.....	−7,000
57	MATCALS (OCO)	27,080	25,080
.....	ASPARCS—Unjustified Cost Growth	.....	−2,000
74	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION (OCO)	1,800	1,800
94	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS (OCO)	0	4,600
.....	AM–2 Matting Expeditionary Airfield—Requested Transfer from OM,MC	.....	+4,600
99	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT (OCO)	26,024	10,024
.....	CSEL Excess to Need	.....	−16,000
117	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP (OCO)	132,386	10,386
.....	JCREW—Funding No Longer Required	.....	−122,000
122	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES (OCO)	1,234	1,234
123	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS (OCO)	420	420
124	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP (OCO)	55,474	41,474
.....	Contract Delays	.....	−14,000
126	TACTICAL VEHICLES (OCO)	91,802	91,802
129	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (OCO)	26,016	26,016
131	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT (OCO)	33,659	33,659
137	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT (OCO)	2,775	2,775
146	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT (OCO)	46,417	38,917
.....	ATFP Afloat—Ahead of Need	.....	−7,500
149	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (OCO)	4,942	4,942
.....	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	480,735	316,835
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		
2	LAV PIP (OCO)	152,333	37,573
.....	Baseline Budget Requirement	.....	−114,760
5	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER (OCO)	103,600	103,600
6	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM (OCO)	145,533	145,533
7	WEAPONS & COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 M (OCO)	7,329	7,329
9	MODIFICATION KITS (OCO)	12,000	12,000
10	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM (OCO)	18,571	18,571
16	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER (OCO)	112,424	112,424
17	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT (OCO)	15,962	38,762
.....	OCO Shortfall—ETMS and Obsolescence Upgrades	.....	+22,800
19	MODIFICATION KITS (OCO)	18,545	3,345
.....	Unexecutable Funding—CESAS	.....	−15,200
20	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC) (OCO)	11,549	11,549
21	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS (OCO)	41,031	41,031
22	RADAR SYSTEMS (OCO)	5,493	10,993
.....	OCO Shortfall—TPS–59	.....	+5,500
23	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM (OCO)	4,710	4,710
24	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT (OCO)	82,897	82,897
26	DCGS–MC (OCO)	21,789	21,789
28	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES (OCO)	29,412	29,412
29	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS (OCO)	36,256	36,256
30	RADIO SYSTEMS (OCO)	155,545	110,545
.....	E–LMR—Not an OCO Requirement	.....	−45,000
31	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS (OCO)	63,280	28,280
.....	Previously Funded UUNS	.....	−35,000
35	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP) (OCO)	12,994	0
.....	Service Requested Reduction	.....	−12,994
37	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT (OCO)	80,559	80,559
38	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP (OCO)	109,100	109,100
39	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS (OCO)	22,130	22,130
42	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT (OCO)	17,799	27,399
.....	OCO Shortfall—ECU and SFRS	.....	+9,600
43	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT (OCO)	1,628	16,758
.....	OCO Shortfall—Tank and Pump Modules	.....	+15,130
44	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS (OCO)	83,698	89,498
.....	OCO Shortfall—Liquid Fuel Storage	.....	+5,800
45	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED (OCO)	41,536	41,536
47	EOD SYSTEMS (OCO)	213,985	188,985
.....	Excess to Requirement	.....	−25,000
48	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT (OCO)	5,200	5,200
50	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP (OCO)	58,264	58,264
53	TRAINING DEVICES (OCO)	55,864	55,864
54	CONTAINER FAMILY (OCO)	8,826	8,826
56	FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEHICLE (OCO)	28,401	28,401
.....	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	1,778,243	1,589,119
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
1	F–35 (OCO)	204,900	0
.....	Unjustified Request	.....	−204,900
19	CV–22 (OCO)	.....	70,000
.....	Program Increase—Provides for One Additional Combat Loss Aircraft	.....	+70,000
25	HH–60M OPERATIONAL LOSS REPLACEMENT (OCO)	114,000	417,400
.....	Program Increase (Adds 10 Aircraft, Not Less Than Four for the Air National Guard)	.....	+303,400
26	RQ–11 (OCO)	9,380	9,380
34	MQ–9 (OCO)	216,000	376,814
.....	Spares	.....	−55,186
.....	Transfer 12 Aircraft from Title III	.....	+216,000
37	B–1B (OCO)	8,500	8,500

P–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
39	A–10 (OCO)	16,500	16,500
44	C–5 (OCO)	73,400	73,400
47	C–17A (OCO)	224,450	176,450
.....	Program Decrease	.....	−48,000
56	KC–10A (ATCA) (OCO)	3,540	3,540
62	C–130 (OCO)	166,720	166,720
63	C–130 MODS INTEL (OCO)	10,900	10,900
66	COMPASS CALL MODS	10,000	10,000
72	H–60 (OCO)	81,000	153,200
.....	Excess to Need for Radars	.....	−61,000
.....	Program Increase—Transportable Blackhawk Operation Simulators	.....	+92,800
.....	Program Increase—Control Display Unit Mission Processors	.....	+12,500
.....	Program Increase—GPS/Inertial Navigation Units	.....	+27,900
75	OTHER AIRCRAFT (OCO)	61,600	61,600
78	MQ–9 PAYLOAD—UAS	45,000	160,383
.....	Transfer from Title III	.....	+115,383
79	CV–22 MODS (OCO)	830	830
80	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	10,900	10,900
98	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES (OCO)	57,500	218,138
.....	Transfer from Title III	.....	+160,638
104	DARP (OCO)	47,300	47,300
.....	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	1,362,420	1,991,955
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
5	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE (OCO)	41,621	41,621
10	AGM–65D MAVERICK (OCO)	15,000	15,000
.....	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	56,621	56,621
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		
2	CARTRIDGES (OCO)	30,801	30,801
4	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS (OCO)	53,192	53,192
5	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION (OCO)	147,991	147,991
11	FLARES (OCO)	20,486	20,486
12	FUZES (OCO)	24,982	24,982
13	SMALL ARMS (OCO)	15,507	15,507
.....	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	292,959	292,959
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
2	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE (OCO)	7,350	5,350
.....	Contract Savings	.....	−2,000
5	SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES (OCO)	15,540	13,540
.....	Uparmored HMMWV—Unjustified Cost Growth	.....	−2,000
11	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000(VEHICLES)(OCO)	690	690
16	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT (OCO)	1,400	1,400
19	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMEN	4,354	4,354
20	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST (OCO)	9,825	0
.....	OS–21 Contract Delays	.....	−9,825
28	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM (OCO)	6,100	6,100
38	USCENTCOM (OCO)	28,784	28,784
44	MILSATCOM SPACE (OCO)	4,300	4,300
46	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM (OCO)	8,200	8,200
47	TACTICAL C–E EQUIPMENT (OCO)	2,552	2,552
52	COMM ELECT MODS (OCO)	470	470
53	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES (OCO)	8,833	4,433
.....	NVCD–NSL Contract Delays	.....	−4,400
57	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS (OCO)	131,559	16,759
.....	JCREW Ahead of Need	.....	−114,800
56	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT (OCO)	9,070	9,070
59	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT (OCO)	16,588	16,588
66	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG (OCO)	9,700	9,700
.....	OTHER PROGRAMS (OCO)	2,822,166	2,736,303
.....	Classified Adjustment	.....	−85,863
.....	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	3,087,481	2,868,593
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		
5	DIA SUPT TO CENTCOM INTELLIGENCE ACT (OCO)	27,702	27,702
18	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYS (OCO)	1,000	1,000
20	TELEPORT PROGRAM (OCO)	6,191	6,191
23	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK (OCO)	520	520
35	AEGIS FIELDING	0	189,720
.....	SM–3 Block IA—Additional 20 Interceptors	.....	+189,720
50	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD (OCO)	5,700	5,700
52	UNDISTRIBUTED, INTELLIGENCE	15,000	15,000
XX	OTHER PROGRAMS (OCO)	323,486	333,675
.....	Classified Adjustment	.....	+10,189
55	ROTARY WING UPGRADES & SUSTAINMENT (OCO)	5,600	5,600
55A	MH–47G	0	28,500
.....	Combat Loss Replacement Aircraft	.....	+28,500
56	MH–47 SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROG (OCO)	4,222	15,222
.....	Modifications for Combat Loss Replacement Aircraft	.....	+11,000
57	MH–60 SOF MODERNIZATION (OCO)	0	7,800
.....	Modifications for Combat Loss Replacement Aircraft	.....	+7,800
58	NON-STANDARD AVIATION	0	121,268
.....	Medium NSAV—Transfer from Title III	.....	+121,268
63	CV–22 SOF MODIFICATION	0	15,000
.....	Modifications for Combat Loss Replacement Aircraft	.....	+15,000
64	MQ1 UAS(OCO)	8,202	8,202
65	MQ–9 UAV (OCO)	4,368	4,368
71	SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT (OCO)	75,878	65,878
.....	Execution Delays	.....	−10,000
72	SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION (OCO)	49,776	49,776
73	COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT & ELECTRONICS (OCO)	9,417	31,817
.....	Program Increase—Unfunded Requirement	.....	22,400
74	SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS (OCO)	149,406	81,306
.....	Leased Aircraft—Unjustified Request	.....	−42,800
.....	HF–TTL Baseline Budget Requirement	.....	−25,300
81	TACTICAL VEHICLES (OCO)	36,262	91,262
.....	Program Increase—Unfunded Requirement	.....	+55,000
83	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS (OCO)	30,000	0
.....	OCO Program Growth	.....	−30,000
88	SOF AUTOMATION SYSTEMS (OCO)	1,291	1,291
90	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE (OCO)	25,000	25,000
92	SOF VISUAL AUGMENTATION, LASERS & SENSORS (OCO)	3,200	22,700
.....	Program Increase—Unfunded Requirement	.....	+19,500
93	SOF TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS (OCO)	3,985	3,985
96	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT (OCO)	5,530	5,530
97	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS (OCO)	79,869	95,545
.....	Program Increase—Unfunded Requirement	.....	+51,376
.....	Requirement Addressed by Reprogramming	.....	−35,700
.....	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	2,941	2,941

P–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
.....	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	874,546	1,262,499
	NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT		
.....	NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT	0	850,000
.....	Program Increase—Army Reserve	.....	+140,000
.....	Program Increase—Navy Reserve	.....	+70,000
.....	Program Increase—Marine Corps Reserve	.....	+70,000
.....	Program Increase—Air Force Reserve	.....	+70,000
.....	Program Increase—Army National Guard	.....	+250,000
.....	Program Increase—Air National Guard	.....	+250,000
	MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROTECTED VEHICLE FUND		
.....	MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROTECTED VEHICLE FUND	3,415,000	3,415,000
.....	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT	21,361,868	25,316,335

R–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY		
48	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY (OCO)	0	23,100
.....	Program increase—Aviation night and limited visibility sensor demonstration	.....	+23,100
60	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY (OCO)	57,900	14,900
.....	HFDS—Transfer to line 75 for execution at request of the Army	.....	−48,000
.....	REF—Transfer from Title IV for OCO requirement	.....	+5,000
61	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM—ADV DEV	0	7,800
.....	Transfer from JIEDDO—Air Vigilance	.....	+7,800
75	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT (OCO)	5,400	48,000
.....	HFDS Transfer from line 60 for execution at request of the Army	.....	+48,000
.....	Long-term development effort	.....	−5,400
77	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM (OCO)	8,100	8,100
171	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (OCO)	63,306	0
.....	Protected Information—Biometrics—Transfer to line 171x	.....	−25,134
.....	Transfer to OP,A line 51 at request of the Army	.....	−38,172
171x	FAMILY OF BIOMETRICS	0	25,134
.....	Non-MIP Biometrics—Transfer from line 171	.....	+25,134
178	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS (OCO)	16,200	16,200
.....	TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY	150,906	143,234
	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY		
19	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY (OCO)	14,100	10,680
.....	Unjustified request	.....	−3,420
53	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT (OCO)	1,000	1,000
75	JOINT COUNTER RADIO CONTROLLED IED ELECTRONIC WARFARE (OCO)	0	11,800
.....	Network Enabled EW—Transfer from JIEDDO	.....	+11,800
124	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT (OCO)	300	300
153	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT (OCO)	5,200	5,200
204	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	0	36,000
.....	Transfer from OM,MC for Qualitative Risk Assessment	.....	+36,000
213	RQ–7 UAV (OCO)	6,900	6,900
999	OTHER PROGRAMS (OCO)	32,901	32,901
.....	TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY	60,401	104,781
	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE		
17	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	0	56,000
.....	Blue Devil Block 2—Transfer from JIEDDO	.....	+56,000
36	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY (OCO)	16,000	16,000
66	TACTICAL DATA NETWORKS ENTERPRISE (OCO)	30,000	30,000
128	MQ9 UAV (OCO)	0	88,500
.....	VADER/DDR on MQ-9—Transfer from JIEDDO	.....	+88,500
145	CSAF INNOVATION PROGRAM (OR ISR INNOVATIONS)	0	112,000
.....	ISR Sensor Pilot Program	.....	+112,000
164	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS (OCO)	4,443	4,443
211	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING (OCO)	6,100	6,100
230	SPECIAL TACTICS/COMBAT CONTROL (OCO)	10,325	10,325
999	OTHER PROGRAMS (OCO)	199,373	161,014
.....	Classified Adjustment	.....	−38,359
.....	TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE	266,241	484,382
	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE		
56	DARPA SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	0	40,000
.....	Transfer from JIEDDO—Wide Area Surveillance Development Roadmap	.....	+40,000
197	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS DCS (OCO)	23,125	23,125
202	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (OCO)	750	750
254	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT (OCO)	9,440	9,440
255	SOF Operational Enhancements	0	14,500
.....	Transfer from JIEDDO—EW Family of Systems	.....	+14,500
999	OTHER PROGRAMS (OCO)	123,925	134,801
.....	Classified Adjustment	.....	+3,376
.....	Transfer from JIEDDO—Wallaby	.....	+7,500
.....	TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE	157,240	222,616
.....	TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION	634,788	955,013
	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM		
.....	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,398,092	1,398,092
.....	IN-HOUSE CARE	709,004	709,004
.....	PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	538,376	538,376
.....	CONSOLIDATED HEALTH CARE	128,412	128,412
.....	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT/IT	2,286	2,286
.....	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS	518	518
.....	EDUCATION AND TRAINING	18,061	18,061
.....	BASE OPERATIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS	1,435	1,435
.....	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	0	24,000
.....	Blast Recovery Monitors—Transfer from JIEDDO	.....	+8,000
.....	Body Blood Flow Monitor—Transfer from JIEDDO	.....	+9,000
.....	EMF Blast Pulse Effects—Transfer from JIEDDO	.....	+7,000
.....	TOTAL, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	1,398,092	1,422,092
	DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE		
.....	AFGHANISTAN AIR MOBILITY	141,634	141,634
.....	AFGHANISTAN BORDER FACILITIES	5,000	5,000
.....	AFGHANISTAN BORDER POLICE EQUIP	19,500	19,500
.....	AFGHANISTAN BORDER TRAINING	20,000	20,000
.....	CENTCOM SUPPORT—AFGHANISTAN COUNTER NARCOTICS POLICE AFGHANISTAN	3,000	3,000
.....	FACILITIES	25,295	25,295
.....	TRAINING COUNTER NARCOTICS POLICE AFGHANISTAN (CNP–A)	50,250	50,250

R–1		Budget Request	Recommendation
	EQUIPMENT	1,241	1,241
	INTELLIGENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	61,500	−56,900
	Program Adjustment		−4,600
	PAKISTAN	49,590	49,590
	KAZAKHSTAN	7,850	7,850
	KYRGYZSTAN	27,900	27,900
	TAJIKISTAN	8,500	8,500
	TURKMENISTAN	10,350	10,350
	UZBEKISTAN	8,500	8,500
	YEMEN	17,000	17,000
	PROGRAM ADJUSTMENT		−12,000
	TOTAL, DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	457,110	440,510
	JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND		
1	ATTACK THE NETWORK	1,434,400	765,200
	Transfer to Staff and Infrastructure for proper execution		−238,800
	Air Vigilance—outside JIEDDO mission—Transfer to RDTE,A line 61 and OM,A line 411 for proper execution		−13,200
	Blue Devil Block 2—Transfer to RDTE,AF line 17 for proper execution		−56,000
	Copperhead—program terminated		−125,000
	Electronic Warfare Family of Systems (EW FoS)—Transfer to SOCOM, RDTE,DW for proper execution		−14,500
	JUON Reserve		+100,000
	Solar ISE—outside JIEDDO mission		−7,000
	Synchronization and Integration WTI Cell—Transfer to OM,A SAG 135 and OM,DW for proper execution		−6,400
	Thermal Station (National IED Exploitation Facility (NIEF))—Transfer to OM,A SAG 135 for proper execution		−13,000
	VADER development—Transfer $88.5 million to RDTE,AF line 128		−241,800
	Wallaby—Transfer to RDTE,DW for proper execution		−7,500
	Wide Area Surveillance Development Roadmap (WASDP)—Transfer to DARPA for proper execution		−40,000
	Wolfhound II—Transfer to OM,DW for proper execution		−6,000
2	DEFEAT THE DEVICE	1,529,390	1,223,090
	ACES HY Roadmap—Program terminated		−28,000
	Transfer to Staff and Infrastructure for proper execution		−105,000
	Beachcomber—Transfer to OM,A SAG 135 for proper execution		−3,000
	Counter Bomber—Transfer to OM,A SAG 135, OM,N, OM,MC and OM,AF for proper execution		−3,000
	CREW—SSM—Universal Test Set Transfer to OM,A SAG 135, OM,N and OM,MC for proper execution		−5,000
	JUON Reserve		−105,000
	Networked Enabled EW—Transfer to RDTE,N line 75 for proper execution		−11,800
	Personnel Borne IED/Vehicle Borne IED (PBIED/VBIED)—Transfer to OP,A line 136 for proper execution		−28,000
	Starlite Development Program—Program terminated		−16,000
	Transfer to OM,A SAG 135 and OM,MC for proper execution		−1,500
3	TRAIN THE FORCE	286,210	170,410
	Transfer to Staff and Infrastructure for proper execution		−75,400
	Blast Recovery Monitors—Transfer to DHP RDTE for proper execution		−8,000
	Body Blood Flow Monitor—Transfer to DHP RDTE for proper execution		−9,000
	EMF Blast Pulse Effects—Transfer to DHP RDTE for proper execution		−7,000
	Technical Collection Training Program—Transfer to OM,A SAG 135 for proper execution		−16,400
4	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE	0	635,068
	Transfer from Title VI		+215,868
	Transfer from Attack the Network for proper execution		+238,800
	Transfer from Defeat the Device for proper execution		+105,000
	Transfer from Train the Force for proper execution		+75,400
	TOTAL, JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND	3,250,000	2,793,768
	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL		
	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	10,529	10,529
	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	10,529	10,529
	TOTAL, OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS	5,115,731	4,666,899

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that speakers on the Republican side be limited to 10 minutes each, with Senator COBURN controlling up to 25 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the two proposals, the Democratic proposal and the Republican proposal from the House known as H.R. 1. I am going to reluctantly support H.R. 1. It reduces government spending by about $61 billion below last year's levels. The reason I am reluctantly supporting it is because I don't think it goes far enough.

We have heard the other side rail that the cuts are too large, but let me bring to the attention of my colleagues a few quotes.

This is from ADM Mike Mullen, Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff:

I believe that our debt is the greatest threat to our national security.

We know our national debt is over $14 trillion. This year, we are spending, in excess of what we take in, almost $1.6 trillion. All we are talking about in the House bill is reducing that amount by $61 billion—a paltry amount.

A few other quotes.

This is from Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner on February 17:

It is an excessively high interest burden. It's unsustainable. With the President's plan, even if Congress were to enact it, and even if Congress were to hold to it and reduce those deficits as a percentage of GDP over the next 5 years, we would still be left with a very large interest burden and unsustainable obligations over time.

He also said:

Our deficits are too high. They are unsustainable.

I think everybody agrees.

They are unsustainable and, if left unaddressed, these deficits will hurt economic growth and make us weaker as a nation.

One of the bills before the Senate starts to address it. The other bill virtually ignores the deficit.

This is from the President:

What my budget does is to put forward some tough choices, some significant spending cuts so that by the middle of this decade our annual spending will match our annual revenues. We will not be adding more to the national debt.

It is absolutely incredible that the President could make such a comment when looking at his budget. His budget takes us from $14 trillion in debt to $27 trillion in debt over the next decade, almost doubling the national debt. He says we are going to be living within our means?

Here is a graph. In 2010, we are at about $13.5 trillion. We see that over the decade we go up further, further, and down here in 2021, it is $26.3 trillion. This is virtually a doubling of the national debt.

That is why when Timothy Geithner says it is unsustainable—the Secretary of the Treasury appointed by President Obama—we all agree. So when are we going to get spending under control? We literally have to quit spending money we do not have because we are bankrupting the very future of America.

I wish to quote a few Senators from the other side of the aisle.

Senator JOE MANCHIN said:

The most powerful person in these negotiations, our President, has failed to lead this debate or offer a serious proposal for spending cuts.

He also said:

[The Democratic bill] utterly ignores our fiscal reality, that our Nation is badly in debt and spending at absolutely unsustainable and out-of-control levels. We must turn our financial ship around. But the Senate proposal continues to sail forward as if there is no storm on the horizon.

That is from one of our Democratic colleagues from West Virginia.

The bill proposed by the Democratic majority fails to understand that there is a fiscal crisis in this country. It is a problem of spending.

Senator CLAIRE MCCASKILL of Missouri said:

> I feel strongly that the cuts are not large enough.

Senator MARK WARNER said:

> At some point we need to send some kind of a shock wave across the Federal Government that this time we really mean it.

He was talking about spending cuts. He was talking about getting serious about deficit reduction.

The House bill doesn't do enough, but at least it is headed more in the right direction for getting spending under control. While I might not agree with every one of the spending cuts in it, it is going in the right direction, and shows what we need to do as a Congress. The bill the majority has put before us shows a lack of understanding as to how serious the deficit and the debt are as an issue for the country.

I wish to put this deficit reduction into some sort of context. This year, the Congressional Budget Office says we will spend $1.5 trillion more than we take in. That is what the deficit is this year. According to the President, it is over $1.6 trillion. Those are their estimates. The bottom line is that we are spending about 40 cents more per dollar than what we take in.

This graph shows the spending proposals before us. This is how much the deficit is. The House bill will reduce that deficit by this tiny slice of the pie. The Democratic majority bill will reduce it by this little tiny slice of the pie right here. So the House bill is a small slice, but at least it is a larger slice than what the Democratic majority has offered. The bottom line is that this is pathetic and will do nothing to actually put us on a sustainable fiscal path where we can start living within our means and quit spending money we do not have.

The House bill itself is actually a 4-percent reduction in the amount of money we are borrowing. If we think about it, this year, since we are borrowing 40 cents out of every dollar we spend, to put that in terms that maybe a family would understand, it would be as if a family making $60,000 a year were going to spend $100,000. Any family would understand that is unsustainable. They could not continue along that path. If that same family were to decrease their spending habits by the same amount the Democrats have proposed, out of that $100,000, they would reduce their spending habits by $168. That is all. That is how pathetic this spending reduction is offered by the other side.

We have to get serious. Recently, Senator COBURN requested a General Accountability Office report that came back and identified over $100 billion in duplicative and wasteful spending programs. This GAO report underscores the negligence of the Federal Government when it comes to managing hard-earned taxpayer dollars.

Let me give a couple of facts from that report. It said that the government spends $18 billion on 47 different job-training programs. Yet the President requested another $400 million for a new program that will replicate proven strategies to develop even more job-training programs. Out of the 47 programs, zero are measured for effectiveness. Yet we are going to create more instead of eliminating a lot of the programs and doing the proper oversight this Congress should be doing.

There are 80 programs providing transportation to disadvantaged persons in 8 different departments. The GAO found $2 billion in costs for just 29 of these programs but, with the extent of fragmentation in this area, was unable to identify total costs for the other 51 programs. In other words, they couldn't even identify what the total costs were for these other programs. That is how messed up it is.

The U.S. Government also spends about $63 billion on 18 different domestic food and nutrition programs and about $3 billion on 20 homelessness programs. The report notes:

> This can create unnecessary work for both providers and applicants and may result in the use of more administrative resources than needed.

Let me translate. That means we have too much bureaucracy and too much wasteful spending, so the money doesn't actually get to the people it is intended to help. It gets spent in the bureaucracy.

We also have another almost $60 billion spent on over 100 duplicated and fragmented surface transportation programs.

While I am troubled that the $61 billion from the House isn't enough to tackle the problem, I am astounded by what the other side of the aisle has done. It also continues many of the wasteful programs we have talked about.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting has come under fire. Obviously, this morning their CEO resigned. We have seen the controversies there.

Their bill also spends tens of millions of dollars to help unions organize—overseas, not even in America. Helping unions organize overseas—is that what we want to be doing with American taxpayer dollars?

Today's votes are a choice between modest progress and making the problem worse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 10 minutes.

Mr. ENSIGN. I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENSIGN. The House bill needs to be the floor for what we accomplish out of this process. The House bill isn't nearly enough, and we cannot allow this process to capture a modest improvement in the name of compromise by watering it down to a complete abdication of leadership. The stakes are too high.

Today, I will be reluctantly supporting H.R. 1, the House bill, which cuts $61 billion from last year's spending. It is a modest step in the right direction. The other side has put forward a proposal that should be rejected out of hand because it is completely inadequate. It keeps us spending money we do not have.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 2 minutes and for Senator LEAHY to be recognized following my remarks for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I wouldn't mind the chart from my friend from Nevada staying up because it makes my point.

In a few hours, the Senate will hold an up-or-down vote on H.R. 1, the House Republicans' scorched earth spending proposal that counts among its casualties such critical priorities as border security, cancer research, and food safety inspectors. The House GOP proposal is a Trojan horse, and we will not be fooled by it. It speaks in the name of deficit reduction, but the dirty little secret about the Republican spending plan is that once the dust is settled, it would only decrease the deficit by $5 billion in fiscal year 2011. When we look at the CBO score of the continuing resolution we are operating under and compare that to the House spending bill, the difference by CBO in budget outlays only amounts to $5 billion in fiscal year 2011. We are talking about a difference of $1.36 trillion in budget outlays under the current CR versus $1.355 trillion in budget outlays under the Republican proposal, much as the chart of my colleague from Nevada has shown. In other words, all of the cuts the Republicans are currently proposing will shave a grand total of .3 percent from the deficit.

Some might say it is a start, but in relation to the damage these cuts will do, it is a meaningless start. Their cuts to domestic discretionary spending will do nothing to create jobs or spur short-term economic growth. In fact, the reverse is true. As numerous independent economists point out, we will see a reduction in economic growth almost immediately if H.R. 1 is enacted, and these cuts will harm our ability to prepare for the future because they gut the very priorities we need to invest in to help our economy grow: education, energy investment, technology, and infrastructure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be given 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. So if all these cuts will not improve the economy in the near term and will not help economic

growth in the longer term and will not cut the deficit, then exactly what will they do? They will satisfy a very small but vocal segment of the Republican Party. That is all.

So it is time for a reset. This morning I called for a reset of this budget debate. I think it is important that after today's votes both sides in the debate take a deep collective breath. We should all take stock of how the discussion up to now has become distorted and seek to reset the terms of the debate. It may not happen tomorrow, but in the coming weeks, as the negotiations led by the White House reconvene, we should approach the talks with fresh eyes and a new mindset.

Rather than continuing the fixation on domestic discretionary cuts, which at the same time do huge damage and cut the deficit very little just because of the way they are spent, the next offer and counteroffer should include mandatory cuts and revenue raisers such as oil royalties into the mix.

We will only put a dent in the deficit through shared sacrifice. Focusing simply on domestic discretionary and even leaving out the military will not achieve our goal of deficit reduction. Including mandatory cuts and revenue raisers such as oil royalties will.

The bottom line is this: The blame for the current breakdown in budget negotiations rests with our failure to think big. A bipartisan compromise simply will not be found in discretionary spending cuts alone. We must broaden the playing field. The solution will only come from putting other kinds of cuts, as well as revenue enhancements, on the table. Doing this will also set the table for the larger budget discussions still to come.

I see my colleague from Vermont, so I am ready to yield the floor to him.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I appreciate that. But I think what we are going to do is try to go back and forth.

Mr. SCHUMER. Well, I yield the floor in any case, Mr. President.

Mr. LEAHY. So Senator SESSIONS will go next. But I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from New York. I yield with the consent that I then be recognized at the end of the speech of the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee and congratulate him on a very successful patent bill that passed with an overwhelming vote. I was pleased to work with him on that as a partner for 2 years when I was ranking member of that committee. I think it was a good day.

Mr. President, we will soon be moving toward a vote on the continuing resolution. Apparently, there are going to be two options given to us. The question I would pose to our colleagues and to the American people is, Do we have to do something or can we do nothing? Is nothing an option? That is what the Democratic proposal is—nothing, zero, nada.

So we had in the Budget Committee, which I am the ranking member now, the testimony yesterday of Alan Simpson and Erskine Bowles. Senator Simpson is a Republican from Wyoming, and Mr. Bowles was President Clinton's Chief of Staff and a well-known business and Democratic leader.

This is what they told us yesterday in their written statement. Both of them put this in to us:

> We believe that if we do not take decisive action our nation faces the most predictable economic crisis in its history.

They have spent months wrestling with these numbers. A majority of the members voted for the reforms they proposed, and they gave a lot of time and effort to it. I did not think they went far enough in some of the areas. But I would say they made a real significant attempt to deal with the crisis we face.

In their testimony yesterday they went even further. What do we mean, a ''crisis''? We had a crisis in 2007. That put us in the deepest recession we have had in decades. Greece has had a crisis. That is the kind of thing they are talking about. Forty percent of every dollar we spend is borrowed.

Senator CONRAD, our chairman, our distinguished Democratic leader, asked them:

> What happens, in your judgment, to the U.S., if we fail to get an agreement in the range of what the commission concluded is necessary?

The commission proposes a $4 trillion reduction in our deficit spending over the next 10 years. It should be more. That is what they proposed. President Obama's budget says it reduces it by $1 trillion. But when the CBO scores it, they are going to find it is filled with gimmicks and there will not be any reduction, I predict, in the deficit in the Obama budget, which is disappointing. It is a do-nothing-about-the-debt-problem budget.

So what is going to happen?

Mr. Bowles:

> This problem is going to happen, it is a problem, we're going to have to face up to, in maybe 2 years, maybe a little less, maybe a little more.

Senator Simpson commented:

> I think it will come before 2 years.

We are talking about a crisis.

> I'm just saying at some point, I think within a year, at the end of the year, if they [people who hold our debt] just thought you're playing with fluff—5, 6, 7 percent of this hole—they're going to say, ''I want some money for my paper.'' And if there's anything money guys love, it's money. And money guys, when they start losing money, panic. And let me tell you they will. It won't matter what the government does, they'll say I want my money, I've got a better place for it. . . . Just saying for me, it won't be a year [before we have a crisis].

Well, this is a serious matter. It is not a do-nothing circumstance. So we have a simple choice to make today: Do we take a step, even a small step, that sends a signal to the world that we intend to take action to prevent the crisis, not act after a disaster hits? Or we could do nothing, as the Democratic proposal does.

The Republican proposal will immediately lower spending by $61 billion for the rest of the year. That is a reduction of about 6 percent of the discretionary spending budget. Most States, cities, and counties in America have had bigger deductions than that, and they are still here. They have not ceased to exist, and we are not going to cease to exist if we reduce spending 6 percent. But it will make a difference. That amounts to 4 percent of the total debt. As I will show in a moment, it means a lot more than that.

The Democratic proposal proposes $6 billion, but it is clearly only a $4 billion reduction. That is less than a one-half-of-1-percent reduction in the discretionary spending budget—less than one-half of 1 percent.

Now, this $61 billion is not going to break us. The GAO recently found that the government spends $8 billion on 47 different job training programs—47 different job training programs. We don't have any ability to save money and do more with less in this country? No business would run the way we run the U.S. Government, and this is just one of the typical kinds of duplication and waste that goes on in our government.

We are living in a fantasy world if we think we cannot find $61 billion to reduce out of more than $1 trillion in a discretionary budget. Under President Obama, the discretionary spending increased 24 percent in the last 2 years. It has already gone up 24 percent.

What do you mean we cannot take a 6-percent reduction? We are facing a crisis, a debt crisis. Families across the country are trimming their budgets. They are doing so every day. Washington just keeps on growing and spending and growing.

We had the Education Secretary in the Budget Committee last week. They propose an 11-percent increase in education spending this year. Energy was in—a 9.5-percent increase this next year for energy, they say. And, hold your hat, the Secretary of Transportation was in and proposes a 62-percent transportation budget increase.

So this is where we were, as shown on this chart: over $2 trillion, and we have jumped now to $3.7 trillion. So that is a 24-percent increase. I am not making up these numbers.

Well, what about the deficit numbers? This year, we spend $3.7 trillion, maybe $3.8 trillion. Do you want to know how much our revenue is this year? Mr. President, $2.2 trillion. I know this is unbelievable. The American people probably cannot imagine that we are spending $3.8 trillion and taking in $2.2 trillion, but it is true. Forty cents of every dollar we spend is borrowed. This is why Mr. Bowles and Mr. Simpson and every economist who has ever testified has said we are on an unsustainable path, a path that cannot be continued.

We need to take action now. This is not enough. But it is a step. I think it sends a word to the world's financial markets, the bond vigilantes, that maybe the United States is, in fact, on the road to doing something about the spending we are in.

Our debt will soon be larger than the economy. It will exceed 100 percent of GDP by the end of this fiscal year, amazingly surging our debt load for the whole country. We cannot keep spending what we do not have, borrowing what we cannot pay back. We cannot do this.

Our crushing debt burden is like an anchor dragging on our economy. It slows growth. As the Rogoff and Reinhart study showed, as Secretary of Treasury Geithner acknowledged in the committee, it is already slowing our growth. He also added it is worse than that because it puts us at risk, as Mr. Bowles and Mr. Simpson say, for some sort of debt crisis. It is unpredictable when and how it might occur. That is President Obama's Secretary of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Member's time has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. So we cannot keep delaying. We cannot keep promising to do something tomorrow. We have to have a vote. We will have a vote today. We need to act today. A vote for the Democratic proposal is a vote to do nothing. It is a vote to stay in denial. It is a vote that says deficits do not matter, we can just keep on. But deficits do matter. They have always mattered. They always will matter.

Some say you cannot make any savings from reducing discretionary spending. Let me show this chart because a $61 billion reduction is a reduction of the baseline. When you reduce the baseline, you save that amount every year, even if you have growth in the future years. And it adds up. It is kind of a geometrical reduction in spending and debt that we have to have, and it has been working the other way. We have been increasing dramatically. You know from your business accounting that a 7-percent return on your money doubles your money in 10 years.

We had 24 percent the last 2 years. That is why the government is doubling and quadrupling in size. But this would show, according to our budget staff and the calculators, if you reduce the baseline $61 billion in discretionary spending alone, it would save $862 billion in deficit reduction over 10 years. If we were to freeze that baseline in for just 5 years, not only would we save $860 billion, but $1.65 trillion—enough money to make a real difference in one little act of $61 billion in the reduction of discretionary spending. We have to take that step.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I appreciate the help of the Senator from Alabama on the patent bill which passed last night. It will help us increase jobs without adding anything to the deficit.

We made what I think was a terrible mistake when the Congress voted to support going to war in Iraq—I was one of the 22 who voted against that war—and then voted to cut taxes and borrow the money to pay for the war in Iraq. We borrowed $1 trillion to pay for a war that has not made us safer. It has caused thousands of deaths of Americans and tens of thousands of others, and has degraded our military which will cost billions to rebuild.

We also went into Afghanistan with the intent to catch Osama bin Laden, and when, according to accounts, he was surrounded, our personnel were yanked out of Afghanistan and sent to Iraq, and he escaped into Pakistan, and $1 trillion later, we are still there. Again, borrowed money for those two wars, one that went way beyond whatever it was supposed to and the other one that should never have happened in the first place. We also cut taxes on oil companies and millionaires and everybody else. And now we have a skyrocketing deficit, thanks to those mistakes.

Later today we will vote on H.R. 1, the House Continuing Resolution, and then the Senate substitute. I want to speak briefly about how the Senate CR compares to H.R. 1, particularly funding for the Department of State and Foreign Operations.

First, Senators should know what is in the House CR or, perhaps more importantly, what is not in it.

It is notable that the House defines diplomacy and international development as non-security spending, in spite of, of course, the integral part they both play protecting our security around the globe. It ignores the views of Secretary of State Clinton, Secretary of Defense Gates, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Admiral Mullen, former Chairman General Powell, General Petraeus, President Obama, former Presidents George H.W. Bush and George W. Bush, and every former National Security Adviser. They have all made clear that these investments do directly protect U.S. security interests, not only on the front line States of Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq, but around the world.

President Reagan and former Homeland Security Secretary Ridge also recognized the connection between international assistance and our security. President Reagan said:

> Security assistance programs, an essential complement to our defense effort, directly enhances the security of the United States.

Secretary Ridge said:

> The programs supported by the International Affairs Budget are as essential to our national security as defense programs.

Secretary Gates said:

> I never miss an opportunity to call for more funding for and emphasis on diplomacy and development.

There are a whole lot of other examples, from both Republican and Democratic leaders, which seem to have fallen on deaf ears in the House.

Our Republican friends in the House should know that we cannot counter the influence of al-Qaida and other violent extremists through military force alone. They should know that helping countries such as Southern Sudan rebuild after conflict, building stable democratic institutions in countries such as Egypt, preventing the trafficking of nuclear material and other weapons in the former Soviet Union, educating and providing jobs for youth who would otherwise be fodder for terrorist recruiters in the Middle East, combating the corrosive influence of organized crime in Central America, preventing the spread of deadly viruses in Africa and Asia—viruses that are only one airplane ride away from the United States—or supporting NATO, the International Atomic Energy Agency, or U.N. peacekeeping—these are all parts of our national security. It is the diplomats here and abroad, and the funds they administer, that help make U.S. leadership possible around the world.

While the House press releases claim to adequately fund operations and programs in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq, that is empty rhetoric. Secretary Clinton has said the House CR will unacceptably harm U.S. interests in those countries.

That is only the beginning. The House CR slashes funding for refugees and other victims of disaster by 40 percent, at the same time Members on the other side of the aisle are rightly urging that we help the tens of thousands of Libyans, Tunisians and Egyptians who have fled their homes.

The House CR provides no funding for the Global Food Security Fund which prevents hunger and famine in Africa and Asia and improves America's standing.

It eliminates funding for the Clean Technology Fund which supports exports of solar, wind, and other renewable energy. And by doing so it opens the door wider to China's exports. How shortsighted can we be? It is like owning a business and you have a competitor on the other side of town and you say, Well, we are not going to advertise. We are not going to stock our shelves. We are only going to be open a couple of days a week. Gosh, I hope that competitor doesn't drive us out of business.

It drastically reduces funding to operate our embassies and consulates, which every American traveling, working, or studying overseas depends on. Every one of us as Members of Congress knows when an American constituent has a problem somewhere we turn to our embassies or our consulates to help them. H.R. 1 would slash their funding.

H.R. 1 would also sharply cut funding for global health programs: HIV/AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, and other deadly diseases—denying life-saving drugs and other services to hundreds of thousands of people, condemning women and children in other parts of the world to death.

It would renege on our treaty obligations to the U.N. and to the international financial institutions, threatening our voting shares which our competitors—including China—are eager to purchase.

At a time when China is rapidly expanding its influence globally, the House would have us pull back and say, you take over. You can be the power that other countries turn to, not the United States. Even Great Britain's conservative government, slashing spending left and right, is exempting, and even increasing, international aid, because unlike our Republican friends in the House, they recognize it is a matter of national security.

The impact of H.R. 1 is equally devastating to our domestic programs. From the social safety net to programs that maintain and expand our country's infrastructure, these programs would be slashed.

Numerous economists, from Federal Reserve Chairman Bernanke to Mark Zandi, recognize that the impact of H.R. 1 will be the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs, at a time when our economy is beginning to recover. I hear this daily from fellow Vermonters. Take, for example, the mother who came into my Montpelier office a few months ago and explained how the Head Start Program changed her life. Not only did Head Start provide a reliable, safe, educational environment for her children, it made it possible for her to pursue a college education and be a strong tax-paying part of our society. But H.R. 1 would deny more than 300 of Vermont's children and families these same opportunities.

For those unmoved by cuts to Head Start, H.R. 1 would also devastate one of our best economic development tools: the community development block grant program.

CDBG has a proven track record of putting people to work through housing construction, public service improvement projects and downtown revitalization efforts. The 62-percent cut to CDBG in H.R. 1 would greatly hamper Vermont's ability to move these types of projects forward at a time when they are needed more than ever.

In the past 3 weeks I have heard from hundreds of Vermonters who rely on the community services block grant program, which would also be slashed in H.R. 1. This is a program that serves 55,000 Vermonters whose incomes are at or below the poverty line—some of my State's most vulnerable people. The impact of this cut would shutter as many as six of our largest food shelves, and eliminate assistance for the thousands of Vermonters looking for housing and heating assistance each year.

These are only three of the domestic programs that would be decimated by H.R. 1, part of a veritable laundry list of cuts that target the very programs that give Americans a hand up. Very simply we are talking about cutting, food, shelter, and heat, the basic necessities of life.

Turning again to national security, a frequently asked question is how does the Senate CR compare to the fiscal year 2010 level for the Department of State and foreign operations? The answer depends on who you ask.

In fiscal year 2010, the Department of State and foreign operations received close to $48.8 billion in regular appropriations and $4.1 billion in emergency supplemental funds for these purposes in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, and Mexico. In addition, the fiscal year 2009 emergency supplemental provided about $2 billion for fiscal year 2010 costs related to Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, and Mexico. In other words, these programs received $54.9 billion for fiscal year 2010.

While the Senate CR funding level is $1.38 billion or 2.8 percent above the fiscal year 2010 regular appropriation for the Department of State and foreign operations, it is $4.75 billion or 8.7 percent below the fiscal year 2010 level of $54.9 billion which supports operations and programs that must be continued in fiscal year 2011, a critical fact wholly ignored by the House.

Although even the Senate CR cuts funding for the Department of State and foreign operations by billions of dollars, rather than the slash-and-burn approach of the House, it does so in a manner that seeks to limit the damage to our national security. Here are a few of the ways the Senate CR does that.

Although the Senate CR cuts the State Department's operations budget by $606 million below the request, it provides $552 million above the amount in H.R. 1. These funds support U.S. embassies and consulates, as well as the State Department's diplomatic personnel and operations in Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iraq.

The Senate CR provides $1.5 billion for worldwide security protection. Although $25 million below the request, this is $44.4 million above the amount provided in H.R. 1. This funds diplomatic security agents, armored vehicles, and training to protect U.S. personnel working in dangerous places overseas. It also, incidentally, protects Members of Congress who travel abroad.

The Senate CR provides $625 million for educational and cultural exchange programs, which is $8.2 million below the request and $123.6 million above the amount provided in H.R. 1. These funds, which have traditionally been strongly supported by Republicans and Democrats particularly since 9/11, support exchanges between Americans and citizens of other countries, including the Fulbright, International Visitor Leadership, and Citizen Exchange programs. The House CR would result in the elimination of over 2,500 American exchanges and 8,600 foreign citizen exchanges.

The Senate CR provides $2 billion for U.S. contributions to international peacekeeping, which is $87.3 million below the request and $196.5 million above the amount provided in H.R. 1. These funds pay for peacekeepers in the Sinai, Lebanon, Haiti, Congo, and many other countries that might otherwise descend into chaos and potentially require the deployment of U.S. troops at far greater risk and expense.

The Senate CR provides $1.5 billion for U.S. contributions to international organizations, which is $50 million below the request and $28.5 million above the amount provided in H.R. 1. This funds U.S. membership in the United Nations, NATO, the International Atomic Energy Agency, World Health Organization, and other international organizations that directly protect our security.

The Senate CR provides $39.5 million for the U.S. Institute for Peace, which is $7 million below the request. H.R. 1 does not include any funding for USIP. This funds conflict resolution and peace building, including in Iraq, and has been supported by Republicans and Democrats since Congress first established it. I ask unanimous consent that an Op-ed by GEN Anthony Zinni about USIP in the March 8 New York Times, entitled ''Peace-building that Pays Off,'' be printed in the RECORD after my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. LEAHY. The Senate CR provides $7.8 billion for global health programs, which is $633 million below the request and $884 million above the amount provided in H.R. 1. These funds support programs to prevent and treat HIV/AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, polio and neglected tropical diseases, and to support voluntary family planning and reproductive health.

The total to combat HIV/AIDS is $5.35 billion through the Department of State, which is $145 million below the request and $509 million above the amount provided in H.R. 1. H.R. 1 would deny life-saving HIV/AIDS drugs to some 400,000 people. I wonder how many House Members even know that.

The Senate CR provides $750 million for the Global HIV/AIDS fund, which is equal to fiscal year 2010 and $150 million above the amount provided in H.R. 1. At the House level, approximately 3.7 million people would not be tested for HIV, more than 10 million mosquito nets for malaria would not be provided, and 372,000 testing and treatments for tuberculosis would be halted. Malaria, which is preventable and curable, is a leading killer of African children.

The Senate CR provides $879 million for international disaster assistance, which is $449 million above the amount provided in H.R. 1. These funds support aid to people displaced by war, famine

and natural disasters, such as the earthquake in Haiti and floods in Pakistan. The House would decimate our ability to respond to those catastrophes. That is not the America I know.

Likewise, the Senate CR provides $1.68 billion for refugee assistance, which is equal to fiscal year 2010 and $662 million above the amount provided in H.R. 1. At a time when the number of refugees and other displaced persons in the Middle East, North Africa, and Pakistan is skyrocketing, and protracted refugee crises exist from Burma to Iraq, the House would turn its back on these people.

There are many other examples. The point should be lost on no one. The House CR would cause lasting, unprecedented damage to our global leadership and our security, and cost thousands of American jobs, at the same time that it would have no appreciable impact on the deficit.

The amounts in the House CR or the Senate CR represent only 1 percent of the Federal budget, but it is a critical investment in our security that the House treats as a luxury we can do without. I challenge them to find a single current or former President, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of State, National Security Advisor, or, frankly, anyone with expertise in this area—Republican or Democrat—who would agree with that shortsighted, dangerous view.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Mar. 7, 2011]

PEACE-BUILDING THAT PAYS OFF

(By Anthony C. Zinni)

WILLIAMSBURG, Va.—In voting last month to eliminate financing for the United States Institute of Peace, members of the House of Representatives did not do their research. You will find the institute's competent work behind practically every American success in Iraq and Afghanistan. It has undertaken missions from the Balkans and Sudan to the Philippines and Somalia, where I supported the institute's efforts to mediate conflicts, promote the rule of law and encourage democracy.

This week, as the Senate considers alternatives to the House budget bill, we should remember that the stakes for national security and peace-building are high. The institute was created in 1984, when the cold war was still at its height. Congressional leaders guided by Senator Spark M. Matsunaga, a Hawaii Democrat, saw the need for an institution that would strengthen the nation's ability to limit international violence and manage global conflict. President Ronald Reagan signed the act creating the institute. A bipartisan majority of Congress has supported it since—until now.

The Institute of Peace is like the Marine Corps or special forces for foreign affairs and peace building. When others are fleeing conflict around the world, you'll usually find institute staff members going in. They were working in Afghanistan before 9/11 and were among the first nonmilitary personnel on the ground after the invasion of Iraq in 2003. The institute's headquarters in Baghdad has twice been damaged by rocket and mortar attacks. At the height of the Iraq insurgency, when virtually every other American and international group pulled out their personnel, the State and Defense Departments requested that the institute stay. Under fire regularly, it was the only United States organization outside of those departments that did not flee Baghdad.

But the institute's value goes beyond the bravery and commitment of its staff. In 2007, when the Army's loth Mountain Division arrived in Mahmudiya, a city of half a million in the ''triangle of death'' dominated by Al Qaeda south of Baghdad, officers asked the institute to mediate between Shiite civil authorities and the Sunni sheiks who controlled the area. Institute-trained negotiators convened warring Iraqis to consolidate security, restore services, develop the local economy, enhance local governance and improve the rule of law. Gen. David H. Petraeus called it a turning point in the war.

In the six months before the institute's intervention, there had been 93 attacks on American forces in the area with homemade bombs; in the six months after, just one. Mahmudiya became a cornerstone of peace in the district, allowing the Army to reduce its strength from a brigade combat team of 3,500 soldiers to a battalion of 650, with corresponding savings and reductions in casualties.

In Afghanistan, the institute conducts mediations on issues from refugees to property and water disputes. In the last year, these operations have resolved 18 tribal disputes throughout the country, mostly involving the abuse of women, and included 30 training programs for government officials, lawyers, mullahs, tribal councils and community leaders. The network is even supporting dialogue along the Afghanistan-Pakistan border, the earth's most dangerous frontier—home to Taliban and Qaeda attacks and a wellspring of religious and political extremism.

Congress would be hard-pressed to find an agency that does more with less. The institute's entire budget would not pay for the Afghan war for three hours, is less than the cost of a fighter plane, and wouldn't sustain even 40 American troops in Afghanistan for a year. Within the budget, peace-building is financed as part of national security programs, and is recognized as an important adjunct to conventional defense spending and diplomacy. The institute's share of the proposed international affairs budget, $43 million, is minuscule: less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the State Department's budget, and one-hundredth of 1 percent of the Pentagon's.

The idea that eliminating the United States Institute of Peace would benefit taxpayers is extremely shortsighted and ill informed. America deserves better from Congress than eliminating something that saves American lives and taxpayer dollars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the damage that would be done if H.R. 1 were to become law, and specifically to talk about a few areas I have been paying particular attention to: science and technology, for one, particularly related to energy policy; second, border security and law enforcement; as well as education.

To me, this is not a question of whether there should be cuts in our Federal budget. Clearly, there should be cuts. But the real issue here is whether we should be smart about where we make those cuts. To me, it is clear that H.R. 1 does not represent smart policy about where to make those cuts. It represents a plan to mindlessly cut funding during the remaining 5 months of the current fiscal year in order to send some kind of message to the world that we are serious about deficit reduction. In my view, H.R. 1 sends a message, but it is not the right message. The message it sends is that we, in fact, are not willing to look at serious deficit reduction at this point.

The first area of cuts I wish to talk about contained in H.R. 1 that will severely impact our Nation for years to come and have an effect on how many jobs we can actually create is the area of science and energy innovation. Last December, this Congress passed a reauthorization of what we call the America COMPETES Act. I was very privileged to work, particularly with my colleague from Tennessee, Senator ALEXANDER, on helping to get that legislation enacted. Its purpose was to authorize funding for the Department of Energy's Office of Science, for the National Science Foundation, and for the National Institutes of Standards and Technology for the next 3 years so that by fiscal year 2016, we would have completed a 10-year doubling of the funding for those agencies. I wish to note that this effort was first started during the Bush administration. It has been carried forward during this current administration under President Obama. The effort has enjoyed strong bipartisan support and garnered endorsements from leading industry groups such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Business Roundtable, and the Council on Competitiveness. These organizations recognize that the future of our Nation depends on the strong scientific backbone we need for our workforce in order to out-innovate our competitors around the world. So it comes as a surprise to me to see large cuts being proposed by the House of Representatives in their fiscal year 2011 funding bill to the very programs that all of us seemed to agree are needed to keep us competitive in the years ahead.

What cuts am I talking about? Let me give one example. The Office of Science is the Nation's largest supporter of the physical sciences, and these are the very areas by which we intend to supply a new stream of scientists and engineers to companies such as Intel, Ford Motor Company, and others. The House bill proposes to cut the Office of Science budget by $1.1 billion or 22 percent. The result is an estimated reduction of 4,500 full-time scientists and engineers working on basic endeavors in the area of energy science. It will terminate the Early Career Research Program for young faculty and ongoing graduate programs in the energy sciences. National user facilities that the Office of Science runs for upward of 27,000 researchers from industry and academia will be shuttered or put into a standby status. This

includes the four nanoscience centers across the United States, which have had breakthrough discoveries to propel our industries forward in the areas of solid-state lighting, new drugs, and microelectronics.

Let me talk about some of the other programs impacted in the Department of Energy. The Office of Nuclear Energy, which is leading the way to a new generation of smaller, less costly reactors at places such as Oak Ridge and Idaho National Laboratories, will suffer. The ability to move this bipartisan program forward will cease.

In the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy—EER&E, as it is referred to in the Department—the House bill will result in over 31,000 homes that will not be weatherized, and by July 1, it is estimated that something like 8,000 people who are expected to perform this work will be out of jobs. The program to mix coal with biomass, which shows great promise, will be eliminated, as will programs to fund offshore wind.

Let me cite some other examples of the damage that the House bill will have on other agencies in the COMPETES Act.

The National Science Foundation will have reductions leading to a loss of 10,000 university researchers and graduate students. Being so late in the year—and I indicated we have about 5 months left in this fiscal year—it will reduce the program to train teachers in math and science by 53 percent, at a time when it is widely recognized that other nations are outperforming us in student test scores in these subjects.

I ask unanimous consent that two letters be printed in the RECORD.

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

TASK FORCE ON
AMERICAN INNOVATION,
Washington, DC, March 3, 2011.

Hon. HARRY M. REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADERS REID AND MCCONNELL: Most of the undersigned organizations signed a November 5, 2010 letter to you in support of the reauthorization of the America COMPETES Act. We applaud the Senate for engaging in the hard work that was necessary to achieve a bipartisan majority to enact that legislation in the previous Congress.

Today, we write to urge you to continue to support the goals of the COMPETES legislation. As the Senate considers legislation to complete Fiscal Year 2011 appropriations, we ask that you and your colleagues reject the cuts adopted by the House that would significantly reduce funding for the key research agencies, including the National Science Foundation (NSF), the Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Science, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, as well as science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) education programs contained in that law.

While we recognize that Congress faces a major challenge to reduce federal budget deficits and bring the national debt under control, it is critical that these cuts be implemented strategically, with an eye toward the future economic health of the U.S. As many of us wrote to you last year, continued strong funding of basic scientific research and STEM education programs would help ensure the economic growth needed to restore long-term fiscal strength and national prosperity. The National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, headed by Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson, said it well:

Cut and invest to promote economic growth and keep America competitive. We should cut red tape and unproductive government spending that hinders job creation and growth. At the same time, we must invest in education, infrastructure, and high-value research and development to help our economy grow, keep us globally competitive, and make it easier for businesses to create jobs.

Despite this recommendation, the House has passed a continuing resolution for FY2011 (H.R. 1) that takes the opposite approach to research and STEM education. It would make deep cuts to the NSF, DOE Office of Science, NIST core programs, and other science agencies which would have a devastating impact, magnified by being crowded into the less than seven months remaining in the fiscal year.

For example, reducing funding for the DOE Office of Science by $886 million, or 18 percent below fiscal year 2010, during the last seven months of the fiscal year—an effective 31-percent reduction over the seven-month period—would adversely impact world-class scientific facilities, basic research of national importance, and some of the nation's best scientific and engineering talent. Virtually all DOE national laboratory user facilities—which the federal government built at tremendous expense—would cease operations, affecting some 26,000 scientists and engineers from universities, industry, and government who rely on these unique, complex facilities to conduct their research. The DOE national laboratories would also be forced to furlough or layoff thousands of workers, including highly-skilled research staff and blue-collar workers. Finally, the H.R. 1 reduction would slow or bring to a halt the ongoing construction of a number of advanced research facilities aimed at keeping the United States at the technological forefront and American industry from moving research and development activities abroad, leading to the layoff of thousands of construction workers and ultimately increasing construction costs.

At NSF, the 5.2-percent overall cut (an effective 8.9 percent over the last 7 months) would mean that 10,000 fewer university researchers would receive support for critical research and education. The 16.4 percent cut to vital STEM education programs embedded in the 5.2 percent overall NSF cut would in reality amount to a 28.1 percent reduction during the last 7 months of the fiscal year. A reduction of 53.3% in funding for major construction projects focused on developing advanced sensor networks of ocean and terrestrial observatories would likely lead to schedule delays and cost increases in future years, and severely jeopardize the jobs of roughly 200–300 scientists, engineers, and technical personnel. At a time when our nation desperately needs to enhance its technological workforce, these reductions are seriously counterproductive.

The proposed cut to NIST would require the agency to cut support for contractors by 25% since savings from layoffs could not be achieved in the current year. Contractors at NIST play a critical role in many areas, including cybersecurity research efforts, development of standards for the Smart Grid, and the upgrade, maintenance, and construction of NIST facilities. The cut to the Technology Innovation Program would mean no new awards in the current fiscal year; these would be concentrated in areas of national need such as advanced solutions to repairing, inspecting, and monitoring the nation's infrastructure system and efforts to remove critical bottlenecks in current manufacturing processes that impede U.S. competitiveness.

Congress took a very important step for our nation's future by reauthorizing the America COMPETES Act in 2010, reaffirming its commitment to the science and innovation essential to long-term economic growth. We urge you now to continue implementation funding and to reject the cuts to research and STEM education adopted by the House in H.R. 1.

Sincerely,

The Task Force on American Innovation; Acoustical Society of America; American Anthropological Association; American Association for the Advancement of Science; American Association of Physics Teachers; American Astronomical Society; American Chemical Society; American Geological Institute; American Geophysical Union; American Institute for Medical and Biological Engineering (AIMBE); American Institute of Physics; American Mathematical Society; American Physiological Society; American Psychological Association; American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology; American Society for Engineering Education; American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers (ASABE); American Society of Agronomy; American Society of Civil Engineers; American Society of Mechanical Engineers.

American Society of Plant Biologists; American Statistical Association; American Vacuum Society; Applied Materials, Inc.; Arizona State University; Associated Universities, Inc. (AUI); Association for Computing Machinery U.S. Public Policy Council; Association for Women in Mathematics; Association for Women in Science (AWIS); Association of American Universities; Association of American Medical Colleges; Association of Independent Research Institutes; Association of Public and Land-grant Universities; ASTRA, The Alliance for Science & Technology Research in America; Battelle; Binghamton University, State University of New York; Brown University; California Institute of Technology; Carnegie Mellon University; Case Western Reserve University; Center for Innovation in Engineering & Science Education at Stevens Institute of Technology.

Center for Inquiry; Clemson University; Columbia University; Computing Research Association; Cornell University; Council for Chemical Research; Council of Energy Research and Education Leaders; Council of Environmental Deans and Directors; Council of Graduate Schools; Cray Inc.; Crop Science Society of America; CSTEM Teacher and Student Services, Inc.; Duke University; Ecological Society of America; Emory University; Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology; Geological Society of America (GSA); Georgia Institute of Technology; Hands On Science Partnership; Harvard University.

Human Factors and Ergonomics Society; IEEE–USA; Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology; Indiana University; Intel Corporation; Jefferson Science Associates, LLC; Johns Hopkins University Center for Educational Outreach; KDSL—Know.Do.Serve.Learn; Krell Institute; Maryland Academy of Sciences at the Maryland Science Center; Maryland MESA; Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Michigan State University; Michigan Technological University; Muses3, LLC; National Center for Women and Information Technology (NCWIT); National Council for Science and the Environment; National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON), Inc.; National

Girls Collaborative Project; National Postdoctoral Association.

National Science Center; National Science Education Leadership Association (NSELA); National Science Teachers Association; National Society of Professional Engineers; New Mexico State University; New York University; North Carolina State University; Northeastern University; Oregon State University; PBS; Princeton University; Purdue University; Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; Research!America; Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey; SACNAS; School Science and Mathematics Association; Semiconductor Industry Association; Semiconductor Research Corporation; Sigma Xi, The Scientific Research Society.

Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics; Soil Science Society of America; Southeastern Universities Research Association; Southern Illinois University System; SPIE, the International Society for Optics & Photonics; Stanford University; STEM Education Center University of Minnesota; Stony Brook University, State University of New York; Syracuse University; TechAmerica; Texas A&M University; Texas Tech University; The Association of American Medical Colleges; The Business-Higher Education Forum; The Campaign for Environmental Literacy; The Florida State University; The Johns Hopkins University; The Materials Research Society; The National Center for Manufacturing Sciences; The Ohio State University.

The Optical Society; The Science Coalition; The University of Arizona; The University of Georgia; The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; The University of North Carolina at Greensboro; Tulane University; U.S. Chamber of Commerce; Universities, Research Association, Inc.; University Corporation for Atmospheric Research (UCAR); University of California System; University of California Berkeley; University of California Davis; University of California Irvine; University of California Los Angeles; University of California Riverside; University of California San Diego; University of California San Francisco; University of California Santa Barbara; University of California Santa Cruz.

University of California Merced; University of Central Florida; University of Chicago; University of Cincinnati; University of Hawaii System; University of Illinois; University of Kansas; University of Maryland; University of Massachusetts System; University of Michigan; University of Minnesota; University of Nebraska; University of New Hampshire; University of New Mexico; University of Oregon; University of Pennsylvania; University of Pittsburgh; University of Rochester; University of Tennessee; University of the District of Columbia; University of Virginia.

University of Washington; University of Wisconsin-Madison; Vanderbilt University; Vernier Software & Technology; Washington University in St. Louis; Wayne State University; West Virginia University; Yale University.

COUNCIL ON COMPETITIVENESS,
Washington, DC, February 28, 2011.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Bldg., Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Bldg., Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR REID AND SENATOR MCCONNELL: As the Senate begins consideration of a continuing resolution to fund the federal government through the remainder of the current fiscal year, we want to express our concern with severe cuts being proposed to small but critical portions of the federal research budget that drive economic growth. Robust growth generates jobs, replacing benefit payments to struggling families with receipts that accrue from prospering families. A growing economy will reduce the severity of spending cuts or tax increases necessary to bring our national finances back to a sustainable trajectory.

The Council's 2005 Innovate America report urged that America reverse a precipitous decline in physical science research funding as a share of our economy. The report also advocated improving the number and performance of students in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) disciplines. Scientific research and skilled workers are the basis for new ideas, new technologies, new products and services, new companies, even entirely new industries. The American economy cannot compete and grow if we neglect our capacity to innovate.

Federal investments in these areas are necessary and affordable, yet current proposals being considered by Congress would reduce the budgets of the National Science Foundation, the Department of Energy Office of Science, and the core accounts of the National Institute of Standards and Technology. The cuts would be severe to each agency, but merely symbolic in the context of the larger fiscal challenge. The combined cuts would save 0.039 percent from the FY 2011 budget proposed by the President, but would set back important research, shut down key facilities, and exacerbate the supply and development of skilled STEM professionals.

Cuts to the Office of Science could endanger America's leadership in areas like High Performance Computing, which hold the potential for groundbreaking discoveries and game changing industries. How to make greater use of this comparative advantage we hold in the global economy should be our focus.

While no program (including entitlement programs), department or agency should be off the table in the debate as to how to bring our nation's fiscal house in order, we urge you to consider the negative implications of cuts to research at a time when competing nations are investing heavily in their innovation future.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL R. ALLEN,
Chairman and CEO, Deere & Company.

MICHAEL R. SPLINTER,
Chairman and CEO, Applied Materials, Inc.

WILLIAM P. HITE,
General President, United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters.

CHARLES O. HOLLIDAY, Jr.,
Chairman Bank of America.

DEBORAH L. WINCE-SMITH,
President and CEO, Council on Competitiveness.

Mr. BINGAMAN. The first letter is by the Council on Competitiveness, signed by Sam Allen, chairman and CEO of the Deere Company; Mike Splinter, chairman and CEO of Applied Materials; Chad Holliday, chairman of the Bank of America; William Hite, general president of the United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters; Deborah Wince-Smith, president and CEO of the Council. That letter succinctly states that:

Scientific research and skilled workers are the basis for new ideas, new technologies, new products and services, new companies, even entirely new industries. The American economy cannot compete and grow if we neglect our capacity to innovate.

The other letter, from 175 universities, industries, and laboratories, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, supports the goals outlined in the America COMPETES Act and asks this Chamber to reject the cuts adopted by the House funding bill. This letter states that:

Congress took a very important step for our Nation's future by reauthorizing the America COMPETES Act in 2010, reaffirming its commitment to the science and innovation essential to long-term economic growth. We urge you to continue implementation funding and to reject the cuts to research and STEM education adopted by the House in H.R. 1.

I will move to the issue of homeland security. Over the last several years, we have heard a lot of speeches in the Senate about the need to bolster border security, particularly along the southern border, and enhance homeland security capabilities. Unfortunately, the budget the House has presented falls short in this respect.

The continuing resolution would severely impact the capabilities of the Department of Homeland Security and reduce essential assistance that is provided to organizations at the State and local level. This legislation would be a step back in terms of the progress we are making in securing our border and ensuring that communities and law enforcement agencies along the border have the necessary resources to handle crime and to respond to disasters.

With regard to border security, the House continuing resolution would reduce planned technological, fencing, and security improvements along the southwest border. The legislation would reduce interoperable communication capabilities, and it would cut tactical communications modernization efforts by 50 percent, making it more difficult for law enforcement to respond to emergencies in a timely way.

The House bill would also provide funding for 20,500 Border Patrol agents, rather than the 21,370 the Senate is proposing to fund. This cutback in Border Patrol agents, I think, is shortsighted.

The measure would also severely impact aviation security initiatives. The number of advanced imaging technology screening machines, canine teams, and explosive detection machines would also be slashed by over 50 percent.

FEMA grants that help State and local governments respond to and prepare for disasters would be reduced by about 20 percent.

The House bill would drastically cut back on DHS's cyber security plans—cyber security coverage of the Federal civilian networks would be reduced from about 30 percent to 12 percent.

And with respect to the DHS science and technology directorate, the CR would reduce funding for research and

development by about $600 million—which would mean the elimination of entire research areas, such as border security and cyber security, and the significant reduction in nuclear and explosives research and funding for projects at DOE national laboratories—including a potential reduction of $60 to $80 million for New Mexico's labs. It is critical that we make the investments in research and development now to ensure we stay ahead of emerging security threats.

The House CR also drastically cuts DOJ State and local law enforcement assistance programs that are critical in keeping our communities safe and preventing crime.

State and locals law enforcement grants are cut by 37 percent and juvenile justice programs are reduced by 45 percent. The bill also eliminates funding for the Weed and Seed Program and reduces the COPS Program by 25 percent—the Republican plan originally called for completely eliminating the COPS hiring program, which has been instrumental in keeping police officers in communities across New Mexico, but Democratic efforts in the House to restore the funding were successful. The proposed cuts to the Byrne law enforcement grant program would also result in a $1 million drop in assistance coming to New Mexico.

With respect to education, H.R. 1 contains draconian cuts that would limit opportunities for millions of Americans of all ages and educational levels. It would cut Federal education spending by $11.55 billion, or 16.1 percent. This would be, if approved, the largest education cut in history.

H.R. 1 would cut Head Start by $1.1 billion—15 percent—resulting about 2,000 fewer children in New Mexico receiving early childhood education services that prepare them for success in school.

It would cut title I, which provides academic support to disadvantaged students in public schools, by $693 million. It would also cut the Pell grant maximum award by $845, or 15.2 percent. Mr. President, 57,402 New Mexican students received Pell grants in the 2009–10 academic year, and more are expected to be eligible in coming years. Many low- and moderate-income students in New Mexico would find college less affordable and less accessible under H.R. 1.

These House-passed education cuts would devastate New Mexico's public education system, which is already facing severe State budget cuts. And they would limit our country's future economic competitiveness and security.

In contrast, the proposed Senate Democratic year-long continuing resolution proposal provides stability in Federal education investments. It maintains the Pell grant maximum award while providing modest increases for title I grants, Head Start, and other critical Federal education programs. In today's fiscal climate, H.R. 1's drastic cuts to education investments are irresponsible and would have dire consequences for New Mexico and the country.

It is not a question of whether there should be cuts—but whether we should be smart about where we make the cuts.

To me it is clear that H.R. 1 does not represent smart policy about where to make these cuts. It represents a plan to mindlessly cut funding in the remaining 5 months of the current fiscal year in order to send a ''message'' to the world that we are serious.

In my view H.R. 1 sends a message but not the right one.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a letter from a coalition of corporations and businesses be printed in the RECORD.

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

TAPPING AMERICA'S POTENTIAL,
Washington, DC, March 9, 2011.

Hon. HARRY M. REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Republican Leader, U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADERS REID AND MCCONNELL: We write to you as companies and business organizations that understand the challenge Congress faces to reduce federal budget deficits and bring the national debt under control.

We are well aware that every constituency will plead its case to be spared as you make difficult decisions. However, we believe that leaders set priorities that are in the national interest and determine where the federal government's support is essential for U.S. competitiveness, economic expansion and job growth. The private sector is doing its part to ensure that the U.S. remains the world's scientific and technological leader. Even in the midst of recessions, when revenues are in decline, U.S. businesses invest in research and development (R&D) because those activities support future sales and market leadership. American business largely preserved its R&D intensity throughout the deep economic downturn of 2008–2009.

The private sector cannot replace, however, the federal support for basic science and engineering research and math and science education that undergirds America's national economic competitiveness. Because these investments are the key to future productivity growth, they must remain a top national priority, even while deficit spending is reduced.

The National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, headed by Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson, said it well:

''Cut and invest to promote economic growth and keep America competitive. We should cut red tape and unproductive government spending that hinders job creation and growth. At the same time, we must invest in education, infrastructure, and high-value research and development to help our economy grow, keep us globally competitive, and make it easier for businesses to create jobs.''

That is why we supported passage of the America COMPETES Act in 2007 and its reauthorization in 2010. COMPETES addressed a serious national problem and began to reverse nearly twenty years of flat funding, as a fraction of national output, for federal innovation investments. We applaud the Senate for engaging in the hard work that was necessary to achieve a bipartisan majority to enact that legislation in the previous Congress.

Even in the context of reducing overall government spending, you have an opportunity to reaffirm that commitment and continue to support the goals of the COMPETES legislation. As the Senate completes Fiscal Year 2011 appropriations, we ask that you put a priority on funding for the key agencies that support basic scientific research in the physical sciences and engineering, including the National Science Foundation (NSF), the Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Science, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, as well as science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) education programs contained in the law.

As Congress determines the budget for world-class scientific facilities in the U.S., basic research of national importance, and some of the nation's best scientific and engineering brainpower, our greatest concern is the message that is communicated about America's commitment to sustaining its leadership position in science and innovation. Recent trends indicate that without sustained investment in basic scientific research and developing U.S. STEM talent, America is on a path to ceding our premiere position to international competitors.

In this resource constrained environment, we urge the Senate to prioritize and support strong funding of basic scientific research and STEM education programs. They are essential to U.S. innovation, which in turn produces the economic growth needed to restore long-term fiscal strength and national prosperity.

Sincerely,

Accenture; Advanced Micro Devices; Aerospace Industries Association; Altera Corporation; American Council on International Personnel; A Plus Education Partnership (Alabama); ArvinMeritor; Avery Dennison; Battelle; Bechtel Corporation; The Boeing Company; Business Coalition for Educational Excellence at the New Jersey Chamber of Commerce; The Business Council of New York State; The Business-Higher Education Forum; Business Roundtable; California Business for Education Excellence; CEO Council for Growth (Greater Philadelphia); CH2M Hill; Cognizant Technology Solutions; Colorado Succeeds; Connecticut Business & Industry Association, Education Foundation; Corporate Voices for Working Families; The Dow Chemical Company; DuPont Company; Eastman Chemical Company; Eaton Corporation; Florida Council of 100, Inc.; Freescale Semiconductor Inc.; GLOBALFOUNDRIES; Harris Corporation; Illinois Business Roundtable; Iowa Business Council; Johnson City/Jonesborough/Washington County TN Chamber of Commerce; JPMorgan Chase & Co.; Macy's, Inc.; Mass Insight Education and Research Institute; Massachusetts Business Roundtable; The McGraw-Hill Companies; Medtronic; Micron Technology; Microsoft; Minority Business Roundtable; Motorola Solutions, Inc.; National Gypsum Company; NDIA; Nevada Manufacturers Association; New Mexico Business Roundtable; Nucor Corporation; Ohio Business Roundtable; ON Semiconductor Corporation; Oracle; Owens Corning; Partnership for Learning (Washington); Partnership for New York City; Pennsylvania Business Council; The Procter & Gamble Company; Qualcomm; Rockwell Automation; RR Donnelley; SAP America, Inc.; Semiconductor Equipment and

Materials International; Semiconductor Industry Association; Semiconductor Research Corporation; Siemens Corporation; Software & Information Industry Association; State Farm; Technology CEO Council; Tennessee Business Roundtable; Texas Instruments Incorporated; Time Warner Cable; Washington Roundtable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President in a few hours, this body will vote.

This is a solemn responsibility, one not to be taken lightly.

At Gettysburg, Abraham Lincoln reminded Americans that those who died on that battlefield fought for government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

We are only here because the people, our constituents, sent us here. And every time we vote, we represent them. We represent their aspirations. We represent the dreams of growing families and entrepreneurs. We represent the interests of taxpayers.

Of course, not all votes are created equal. Some are more important than others. And in my view, the votes that we are taking today are transcendent. They are quite literally about the future of this country.

Are we going to be a country with a constitutionally limited government; are we going to be a country that limits the burden of taxation on individuals and families and businesses; or are we going to become Europe?

Are we going to move toward a full-blown cradle-to-grave nanny government with the majority of Americans on the public dole and a small group of individuals bankrolling an ever expanding leviathan state?

In short, are we going to remain America—a beacon of freedom to the world or do we aspire to become a second European Union with high taxes, high spending, and measly economic growth?

Again, I remind you that we represent the aspirations of our constituents.

I represent the people of Utah. And I can tell you that they do not wake up in the morning and say—You know what—America would be much better if we were more like France.

This is no exaggeration.

Right now government spending is at 25 percent of gross domestic product. And if we do nothing, that number is just going to grow, pushing past 25 and cruising toward 28 percent of GDP. The last time we did that was during World War II.

Republicans and Democrats have very different ideas about how to address this spike in spending.

Either we can step off the pedal, hit the brakes, and bring spending back in line with historical levels—levels that respect our Constitution of limited government and respect taxpaying citizens or we can keep the car on cruise control and drive the car off the cliff.

Republicans want to hit the brakes.

Democrats want to pull a Thelma and Louise with our economy.

I, for one, am not going to sit back and let them do this. Let's be clear about what the Democrats and Republicans are proposing.

H.R. 1, the bill that passed the House, appropriates $1.026 trillion in nonemergency discretionary spending.

The alternative offered up by my Democratic colleagues would appropriate, $1.079 trillion in total nonemergency discretionary spending.

H.R. 1, the bill passed by the new Republican majority in the House—a majority that most closely represents the views of millions of Americans who are genuinely scared about our Nation's fiscal trajectory—would reduce spending by $57 billion over the current continuing resolution.

The Democratic alternative would reduce spending by just $4.7 billion.

You will hear Democrats complain about the draconian cuts in the House-passed H.R. 1.

This is nonsense.

The fact is, when you look at Federal nonemergency discretionary spending as a whole—which has exploded under Democrats' control of Congress and with President Obama's acquiescence in their big spending ways—H.R. 1 provides modest cuts.

The people of Utah, and the people of this country, understand this.

So now that Republicans are winning the game on spending cuts, Democrats are seeking to move the goal posts.

It is now being suggested that we can bridge the gap between these two bills by going after entitlements and tax expenditures.

Don't get me wrong, we need to address both. But I can tell the Members on the other side now that we are not going to let you shift the debate.

This is a debate about discretionary spending. This is a debate about low-hanging fruit.

Last week, the Government Accountability Office issued a report detailing possibly hundreds of billions of dollars in government waste and bloat.

There is plenty of fat to be cut in the discretionary budget, and doing so would give our constituents and Members of Congress the courage to go after bigger fish.

Yet, Democrats can't find it in themselves to cut an additional $50 billion when nonemergency discretionary spending is well over $1 trillion.

Some are now proposing that we get into tax expenditures. Tax expenditures are a debate for another time.

Nondefense discretionary spending has grown by 24 percent over the last couple of years. We can cut that back significantly. We need to do so, and Americans understand that going back to 2008 spending levels is not the end of the world.

I also want to correct the record with respect to H.R. 1 and Medicare Advantage.

Yesterday, Secretary Sebelius sent a letter to my colleague, the chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator BAUCUS, suggesting that H.R. 1 would have a detrimental impact on Medicare Advantage.

This assertion is Orwellian. The Secretary knows full well that ObamaCare cuts more than $200 billion from an MA program that currently serves nearly 12 million seniors. According to the administration's own Chief Actuary, these devastating cuts will reduce enrollment in this popular program by 50 percent. Furthermore, the CBO has also found that these cuts would reduce important benefits by 50 percent for seniors enrolled in the program.

H.R. 1 is intended to halt the harmful cuts to seniors in the MA program.

Suggesting otherwise, as the Secretary did, is both inaccurate and risks confusing millions of seniors.

H.R. 1 is a good bill. It is solid and responsible. And I will be supporting it. But it is only a starting point.

The fact is, we are going to need many more cuts in discretionary spending.

The American people—the people who sent us here—have not signed on to the Democrats' project of Europeanizing the United States economy.

Citizens in every State want to roll back spending, reduce the tax burden on families and businesses, and—restore America's promise of opportunity and economic growth.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle need to get with the program. We will be cutting spending. And we need to cut a lot of it. It may not all happen in the next 2 years.

The American people might need to speak again and send people to Washington in 2012 who will accurately represent their interests.

This is a big vote today. And when we look back, I think Americans will say: It was just a beginning.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I used to be a Governor. I sometimes say I used to be somebody. As Governor, you had to propose budgets, you had to balance budgets, and you had to work with the legislature. I followed Mike Castle, and he followed Pete DuPont. We focused very hard on fiscal responsibility. During the 8 years I was Governor, we had eight balanced budgets in a row. For 7 years, we cut taxes. A couple of years, we actually paid down some debt. We ended up with a triple-A credit rating for the first time in the history of the State of Delaware. So I

feel as though I know something about this issue. So do a number of my colleagues.

We are having a lot of debate, as we should, over what our spending plans are going to be in this continuing resolution to fund the government for another 2 weeks, 4 weeks, 6 months. That is well and good and important. We need to get started and demonstrate that we are able to reduce this deficit and reduce our debt. We need to keep in mind that while what we do in the next 6 months is important, what is really important is what we do in the next 6 years and beyond that.

We had a commission put together that a bunch of us supported. We created the deficit reduction commission, chaired by Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson. They gave us a pretty good roadmap of how to get to a more fiscally responsible place in the next few years, cutting some $4 trillion out of the budget deficit. What they said is that pretty much everything needs to be on the table—domestic spending, defense spending, entitlement programs, tax expenditures, tax credits, tax deductions, tax rates. They have suggested a proposal that cuts the deficit by $4 trillion over 10 years, about two-thirds of that on the spending side and maybe one-third or so on the revenue side. I think it is a pretty good approach, and I commend the 18 members of the commission who endorsed that approach.

One of my core values is, everything I do, I know I can do better. I think the same is true of all my colleagues. Frankly, the same is true of Federal programs. What we need to do is to replace what a lot of people think we have in Washington—a culture of spendthrift—and we need to replace it with a culture of thrift. We need to look in every nook and cranny of the Federal Government and all programs and say: Can we get better results for less money or can we get a better result by at least not spending more money? Partnering with the General Accountability Office, GAO, OMB, with all the inspectors general, with nonprofit groups such as Citizens Against Government Waste, what can we do to get better results for less money? That is part of what we need to do long term. We still will have tough decisions, but at the end of the day, we need to save some money, carve out some money. If we have to spend an extra dollar or two, where should we invest that money?

There is a guy named John Chambers, whom the Presiding Officer knows, and some of us met with him earlier today. He is CEO of Cisco, a big technology company. He likes to say that there are two things we need to do if we are to be successful as a nation, with a 21st-century economy: No. 1, invest in people so we have the most productive workforce, smart workers, whether postdocs or people with high school degrees—productive workforce; No. 2, invest in our infrastructure.

Last year, the transportation infrastructure in this country got a D as in ''delta''—not good—a D as in ''dumb.'' That is where our infrastructure is in this country. We need to invest in our infrastructure, not just roads, highways, bridges, rails, and ports, but broadband, water, wastewater—broadly defined infrastructure.

The third thing we need to do is invest in research and development so we can continue to be an innovation economy. The President said that if we are going to be successful in the 21st century, we need to outeducate, outinnovate, outcompete the rest of the world.

We need to invest in our workforce, our very young kids and folks who are off to college and postsecondary training.

We also need to invest in our infrastructure, not just roads, highways, bridges, and rails, but infrastructure described broadly.

Finally, we need to invest in R&D so we can invest and outcompete the best of the world.

At the end of the day, we have to create what I call a nurturing environment for job creation, for job preservation. We need a nurturing environment. Part of that is our obligation working with the private sector and others, States and local governments across the country.

Right now, our debt as a percentage of GDP has climbed to 65 percent, I am told. Sixty-five percent—our debt as a percentage of GDP. The last time it was that high was at the end of World War II. It is the only time it has been that high—65 percent. Other countries getting into that kind of territory are Greece and Ireland. That is not smart. They found out the hard way. We need to learn from them, and this is the time to do it. It requires all of us to stand and do what we know we need to do, to share in the sacrifice, with everything on the table. Let's use the deficit commission as a good role model. Let's ask the executive branch to provide the leadership they need to provide.

I think my time has expired, Mr. President. I note the presence of the Senator from Kentucky so he can take the floor as my time has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, we are discussing and debating two different alternatives—one from the other side of the aisle and one from our side—about what we should do about the budget deficit. We have a projected $1.65 trillion deficit in the next year. I think both alternatives are inadequate and do not significantly alter or change our course.

On the Democrats' side, we have a proposal to cut about $5 billion to $6 billion for the rest of the year. To put that in perspective, we borrow $4 billion a day. So the other side is offering up cuts equal to one day's borrowing. I think it is insignificant, and it will not alter the coming and looming debt crisis we face. On our side of the aisle, we have done more. The cuts are more significant, but they also pale in comparison to the problem. If we were to adopt the President's approach, we would have a $1.65 trillion deficit in 1 year. If we adopt our approach, we are going to have a $1.55 trillion deficit in 1 year. Both approaches do not significantly alter or delay the crisis that is coming.

It is interesting, when we talk about cuts, everybody seems to be giddy around here, saying this is the first time we have talked about cuts. It is better and it sounds good, but, guess what. We are not even really cutting spending. What we are talking about is cutting the rate of increase of spending. The baseline of spending is going to go up at 7.3 percent, according to the CBO. We are talking about reducing that increase to a 6.7-percent increase. We are talking about cutting the rate of increase of government. The problem is, it is not enough. Our deficit is growing by leaps and bounds. Our national debt is $14 trillion. Our national debt is now equal to our entire economy. Our gross domestic product equals our national debt.

I think the President is tone-deaf on this issue. We had an election, and in the election the people said: We are concerned about out-of-control spending. We are concerned about massive deficits. We are concerned about passing this debt on to our kids and our grandkids.

The President recently proposed a 10-year budget, a 10-year plan for spending. He proposes that we spend $46 trillion. That means they are not getting it. Official Washington is not getting what the people are saying, and they are not getting how profound the problems are. Spending $46 trillion?

The President's plan will add $13 trillion to the debt. The Republicans say: Oh, ours is a lot better. Theirs will add $12 trillion to the debt. It is out of control, and neither plan will do anything to significantly alter things.

We are spending $10 billion a day. In order to reform things, in order to change things around, we will have to come to grips with the idea of what government should be doing. What are the constitutional functions of government? What were the enumerated powers of the Constitution? What powers did the Constitution give to the Federal Government? And then we examine what we are actually doing, what we are spending money on that is not constitutional or should not be done here or should be left to the States and the people respectively.

Once upon a time, our side believed education was a function of the States and localities. It is not mentioned in the Constitution that the Federal Government should have anything to do with education. Does it mean we are opposed to education? No. We just think it should be done at the State and local level.

Ronald Reagan was a champion of eliminating the Department of Education. It was part of the party platform for many years. Then we were in charge after 2000, and we doubled the size of the Department of Education.

If you are serious about balancing the budget, if you are serious about the debt, you have to look at taking departments, such as the Department of Education, and sending them back to the States and the localities. You have to look at programs that are growing by leaps and bounds, such as Medicaid and food stamps, cap them, block grant them, and send them back to the States. The States can manage these issues better. The closer they are to the people, the better managed they will be.

The other compromise that needs to occur—and this is something our side needs to compromise on—our side has blindly said that the military should get anything it wants and it is a blank check: What do you want? Here it is.

We have increased military spending by 120 percent since 2001. We have doubled military spending. I am for a strong national defense. I believe it is a constitutional function of the Federal Government to provide for our national defense. I think it is the preeminent enumerated power, the thing we should be doing. But that being said, we cannot every 8 years double the Defense Department, double the military spending.

It is also ultimately the compromise. Within the space of a few years, everyone here will come to an agreement, not because we want to but because we are forced to by the events and by the drama of the debt crisis. It will come. It has come to other nations. When it comes to us, the compromise that both sides of the aisle will have to work out, the other side of the aisle will have to admit that we cannot have enormous domestic spending, and our side of the aisle will have to admit that we cannot give a blank check to the military.

We will also have to look at entitlements. Everyone is afraid to say how we reform entitlements. But there are two inescapable facts with entitlements: We are living longer, and a lot of people born after World War II are getting ready to retire. These are inescapable demographic facts. We have to address them. If we simply do nothing, if we do not address the entitlements, within a decade, entitlements will account for the entire budget and interest. There will be no money left for anything.

Right now, the argument is about all these other programs. There will be no money left for any of these programs if we do nothing. It is going to take both sides of the aisle grappling with this issue and admitting the rules and eligibility will have to change for Social Security and likely for Medicare. If we do it now, we can do it gradually. If we start now, we can gradually let the age rise for Medicare and Social Security for those 55 and under. Young people have already acknowledged this is going to happen. Ask young people anywhere across America: Do you think you are going to have Social Security when you retire? Do you think you are going to get it at 67? Most young people acknowledge it is broken. It is broken so badly that the only way to fix it and continue is we have to look at eligibility. But so many people have said: Oh, we cannot talk about entitlements. You will be unelected. You will be unelectable if you talk about entitlement reform.

The President still makes this mistake. He will not lead us. He will not talk and give a leadership role to entitlement reform. Someone must do it. We must stand up and be bold because the longer these problems fester, the longer we allow them to accumulate, the bigger the problems become and the more dramatic the answers must be.

If we look at Greece and these other nations that have faced a debt crisis, their problem came to a head all of a sudden, and they changed the age on social security like that. If we want to do it gradually and let people plan for their future, we need to start now before we enter into a crisis.

My problem with the discussion and the debate at this point is that I do not think either side recognizes the enormity of the problem or the immensity of the problem. Even people who would be considered to be those of the mainstream—former Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan said there is a 50-percent chance there will be some kinds of monetary problems, significant monetary problems, even to the point of crisis, in the next few years. Many people have said Japan is locked in crisis. That crisis is coming because of the debt they have accumulated. When that comes to America, do we want to have government by crisis? Already we can't even pass a budget. We can't pass appropriations bills. Our bills do not even go to the committees anymore. They come to the floor and we put a patchwork quilt on them. There is a chance this winds up being 2 more weeks. We have government by 2-week edict. It is not the way to run government.

If you want to have a significant plan for changing things, send bills through the committee. If you want a realistic way of running government, have appropriations bills. If you want to be someone who believes in good, responsible government, for goodness' sake, pass a budget. We didn't pass a budget last year.

This chart shows how big the problem is. I wish I had a magnifying glass because that is the only way you could see the other side's proposal—$6 billion in cuts. It is 1 day's borrowing. It is not even 1 day's spending they are talking about. It is insignificant, it is inconsequential, and it will do nothing to delay or alter the looming debt crisis.

Look at the other proposal from our side. It is bigger. You can actually see it without a magnifying glass. But look how it is dwarfed by 1 year's problem. I recently proposed $500 billion in cuts. When I went home and spoke to the people of my State, spoke to the tea party people, they said $500 billion is not enough. They are right—$500 billion is one-third of 1 year's problem. Up here, that is way too bold, but it is not even enough.

We have to counterbalance and understand the alternatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 10 minutes of time.

Mr. PAUL. If we do nothing, all the programs people are so fond of extolling and saying we need money for will be gone.

So I implore the American public and those here to look at the problem and to say to Congress: You are not doing enough. You must cut more.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today as a Senator from California to speak about how damaging I believe the House continuing resolution would be for the people and economy of my State.

I would first like to begin by expressing my approval that Congress is finally talking about controlling the deficit. I have been on the record for many years about our need to rein in spending, and we are finally moving in the right direction.

I believe that government—in some ways—must adopt some of the discipline of a business. Businesses face tough choices about how to allocate resources. Businesses thrive when there is consistency and a commitment to planning for the future. These are things that have been lacking in our budget process of late. And that needs to change.

The 2-week continuing resolution under which we are currently operating would not work for any business in California, and it does not work for the Federal Government.

That being said, I must add this warning: we cannot balance the budget on the backs of California's families and businesses.

And that, unfortunately, is precisely what the House-passed continuing resolution does.

In short, H.R. 1 is budget-cutting by ideology. If our friends on the other side of the Capitol did not like a program, they cut it. Unfortunately, cutting by this sort of political bias left us with a bill that will slash hundreds of thousands of jobs—700,000 jobs by some economic estimates—and many of those in the private sector.

Even worse for my home State of California, the programs that House Republicans chose to cut form the backbone of our job-creation strategy and the heart of many programs on which our working families rely.

Public health and education programs will be especially hard hit.

The budget for community health centers is cut by more than half. In California, these clinics serve 2.8 million patients every year—and for

many, they are the only health care option available. These cuts would force clinics to fire 28,000 doctors and staff.

Funding for Head Start is slashed by 14 percent, depriving 24,000 low-income children in California access to early childhood services. Thousands of teachers and staff will lose their jobs and parents will lose a reliable child care option.

And the title X Family Planning Program is completely eliminated. For California, that means 1.2 million individuals lose health care, counseling and education services. And this ends the program that has been credited with preventing more than 400,000 abortions in 2008 more than 80,000 of those in California.

H.R. 1 would also sacrifice tens of thousands of California jobs. We have the second-highest unemployment rate in the Nation, and this bill will send us in the wrong direction.

Two key priorities for California are in the crosshairs: our clean energy sector and the modernization of our aging infrastructure. And both of these are proven job-creators.

A vital Energy Department loan program will be lost, cutting $40 billion worth of investment. By ending this one program, California developers will be forced to halt 24 projects, killing 76,000 jobs.

Funding for energy research and development will be slashed by $1.9 billion, meaning a loss of more than $200 million for California's laboratories and universities. That means a direct loss of 9,400 jobs and enduring damage to our leadership as a global innovator.

Funding for a high-speed rail initiative will be eliminated, and $1 billion already sent to California will be rescinded. This would likely end California's hopes for a high-speed rail line, and in the process eliminate 20,000 future jobs.

The bill also rescinds funding for nationally significant transportation infrastructure investments. For California, this ends six projects totaling $59 million, including a Los Angeles metro line and a rail project at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach.

As the economy continues its fragile recovery, we simply cannot afford to make dramatic spending cuts driven purely by political ideology. Unfortunately, this is the approach employed by House Republicans.

I support a different course in the Senate. I believe we must pair responsible, targeted spending cuts with smart investments that will support California and the Nation's economic recovery, preserve jobs and protect families.

The Senate bill, introduced last week, takes a more pragmatic approach. Like the Republican plan, the Senate bill imposes significant spending cuts, but it does so through prudent action that will not jeopardize our Nation's economic recovery.

The Senate bill cuts $51 billion from the President's fiscal year 2011 budget request, eliminates earmarks and advances additional spending cuts proposed by the President for fiscal year 2012. However, in contrast to the House bill, this legislation continues support for critical health, infrastructure, education, and energy investments, and provides necessary funding for essential services the American people depend upon every day.

Yes, Mr. President, we need to rein in spending. But we can't do that if we use a political litmus test to pick and choose which programs to cut.

I encourage my colleagues to join with me in opposition to these shortsighted and damaging budget cuts.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today we are faced with two alternative versions of a fiscal year 2011 funding bill. The version that came over from the other body contains an endless list of problems. It slashes fundamental programs that are important to the health and well-being of every America, unleashes attacks on our bedrock environmental laws that protect clear and safe water as well as healthy air, and undermine our efforts to reassert America's leading role in education, research and innovation. Casting a vote against this bill will be easy.

The alternative bill offered by the Senate Appropriations Committee is dramatically better. It is a good faith effort at tackling the deficit while maintaining critical investments in America's future. This bill, however, is not without its problems.

The Senate version of the fiscal year 2011 spending bill restores a substantial portion of the cuts to the nation's water infrastructure contained in H.R. 1. I applaud the committee's effort to protect this critical investment, but it doesn't go far enough. As a nation, we see 650 water main breaks per day. That is the rate of one every 2 minutes and results in the loss of $2.6 billion in water annually. The story on wastewater systems is equally dismal, resulting in sewage overflows and broken pipes on a daily basis. Our drinking water and wastewater infrastructure has been given a grade of D- from the American Society of Civil Engineers.

These system failures aren't just expensive, they are also dangerous. Raw sewage flows into our rivers and streams, forcing local health authorities to warn local residents to avoid contact with rivers, beaches and lakes. Drinking water systems are forced to issue boil-water advisories to compensate for broken systems. We must do better. The investments in water infrastructure in the Senate bill are a step in the right direction, but we should be doing more.

There are other examples as well. The cuts to the conservation programs in the Senate version are disproportionately large. The Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations Program at USDA, for example, is eliminated entirely.

We need to make hard choices about our funding priorities. But we shouldn't be doing so without also having a frank discussion about tax loopholes that cost us billions of dollars annually.

And finally, the Senate bill is a dramatic improvement over H.R. 1 in terms of environmental policy. The other body approved legislative riders that would stop EPA from being able to protect the air Americans breathe every day and it would stop dead in its tracks the Chesapeake Bay restoration effort. The Senate bill, to its credit, eliminates these terrible policy directives. The Senate bill, however, does include a provision that would legislatively de-list the gray wolf from the endangered species list.

I continue to oppose legislative efforts to delist endangered species. We have a regulatory process that is based on scientific data, and we should use it. All that is needed is for the States in the Northern Rockies to submit appropriate management plans to the Department of Interior so that the law can work the way Congress intended.

I have no problem today in voting against the draconian cuts and terrible public policy riders in H.R. 1. My support for the Senate alternative, which is dramatically better, is tempered by my concerns. My vote for the Senate substitute is a reluctant aye. As we move forward to enact a fiscal 2011 spending bill, I hope we will be able to address the issue I have outlined here to make sure that the American people are getting the kinds of investments and savings that they deserve.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I rise today to express my dismay at some of the irresponsible cuts in H.R. 1, particularly the elimination of a program of personal importance, The Corporation for National and Community Service which is home to the AmeriCorps and Volunteers in Service to America—VISTA—programs. I stand by a commitment to reduce the deficit, but we cannot be irresponsible in cuts to such essential programs that help the people of West Virginia and the rest of the United States.

As you may know, I came to West Virginia in 1964 as a VISTA worker which is now a part of the Corporation along with other public service organizations. My decision to join VISTA was one of the most important decisions of my life. While my goal was to help the people of Emmons, WV, that community came to help me much, much more. It gave me a new focus of public service which has led me into a fulfilling and meaningful career. Sargent Shriver was the shining light and soul of VISTA and many other public service initiatives. Through these programs, he inspired me to find my true home in West Virginia, and I have no doubt that he profoundly impacted the lives of many other volunteers. VISTA, AmeriCorps and all the public service programs under the Corporation provide opportunity for everyone from young people to seniors. As a young man, it changed the direction of my

life. It provides service opportunities which can provide educational vouchers and jobs skills.

There were over a thousand applicants in 2010 to the West Virginia branch of AmeriCorps. I cannot support the continuing resolution from the House which eliminates this program and says ''no thanks'' to them. Since 1994, over 9,300 West Virginians have served over 14 million hours in efforts to better communities across the state. Over 7,600 disadvantaged children and youth in West Virginia will be left without a tutor or mentor, directly impeding their ability to achieve the academic gains needed to succeed. This not only damages communities today but also damages our future workforce; we cannot rob young people of a better future.

By eliminating AmeriCorps and VISTA, we are missing an opportunity to develop lifelong public servants and leaders—the public servants and leaders our country needs now more than ever before. Nationally, through the elimination of AmeriCorps and VISTA, we would lose the volunteer service of nearly 75,000 people. Across the country, elimination of AmeriCorps and VISTA would have a devastating impact.

I was told of the story of Elvin Campbell, an AmeriCorps member and military veteran, serving in Charleston, WV. Elvin works with homeless individuals, providing them with life skills, helping them prepare a resume, search for a job and successfully budget their finances.

Last year, Elvin helped 127 people go from being unemployed to self-sufficient, contributing members of society. Without Elvin, there are 127 people who would otherwise be unemployed, an investment in AmeriCorps is an investment in jobs across this country. Elvin is one of 10 veterans doing work like this throughout the Charleston area. Through AmeriCorps, these military heroes help grow our economy and move my State, and our Nation forward.

We talk quite a bit about jobs around here. Elvin's example shows us that dedicated public servants can give our citizens the necessary skills to attain jobs throughout West Virginia. H.R. 1 eliminates AmeriCorps which was organized under President Clinton and expanded more than 50 percent by President Bush. Democratic and Republican administrations alike have realized it is a great investment, leading to over 60 million volunteer hours last year. In West Virginia alone, AmeriCorps volunteers have served over a million hours last year, improving West Virginia communities across the State.

Without AmeriCorps, West Virginia would lose 800 AmeriCorps servicemembers and 115 year-long VISTA slots, translating into over 691,000 service hours, combined. The loss of the VISTA slots is estimated to result in the loss of 18,720 volunteers providing over 397,000 hours of service to West Virginia communities. Each state would face similar cuts and be faced with the consequences.

I urge my colleagues not to support these cuts in H.R. 1. Of course, this program is just one of many the continuing resolution approved by the House proposes for elimination. I am willing to work together with my colleagues to identify real savings, but I cannot support H.R. 1 or the reckless cuts it proposes.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, we need to make serious and substantial cuts and we also need to compromise. Cuts and compromise need to be the dialog occurring across the aisle and with each other. I have great respect for some of my colleagues on the other side who say we have a structural debt problem and we have to get to it. Certainly we do.

But it is completely wrong that we would do massive cuts all in one fell swoop right now with our economy in the position that it is. That would cause as big a crisis as our failure to deal with our long-term structural debt. So that is where the compromise part comes in. We have to do significant cuts now, we have to put everything on the table and look at our long-term debt structure and we need to figure out how we do that in a bipartisan way, because we are going to fail our country if no one is willing to compromise.

The House resolution, frankly, was not smart in the way they did the cuts. No one in any business would take all the cuts out of one small sliver of their business. They would look at their entire business to try to find cost savings. It was not smart that all the pain was in one place, and they are killing off the very part of our budget that has the best chance of increasing economic activity in this country—the building of roads and bridges, the educating of our kids, the research and the science and development. So while their cuts were more substantial than the Democrats' plan in the Senate, they were not smart cuts. They did not spread the pain around.

On the other hand, the Senate has not gone far enough. It is, frankly, disappointing to me. I still think there are way too many people in denial around here about the nature of the problem and how serious it is, and I don't think we are demonstrating to the American people we understand the nature of the problem when we present an alternative proposal with such a small number of cuts. The sweet spot is somewhere in between these two approaches. Pain needs to be spread more broadly throughout the budget so the pain is not so acute in one area of the budget, and we need to look at all the programs, put it all on the table, and we need to be able to compromise.

Let me point out where I think some of the compromises could come easy. The Senate version, which I will not be able to support—the Senate Democratic version—increases the President's budget in 15 different programs. Think about that. We are trying to cut, and our appropriators have come up with a plan to increase 15 of the President's budget requests by a total of $2.6 billion. We are going the wrong direction. We should be, at a minimum, cutting what the President has recommended cutting. Frankly, I think we need to go even further.

The Pentagon. Let me give one example that came up in a hearing yesterday so people understand there are real savings. We have a Pentagon that we can't audit, and we haven't been able to audit for decades. It is frustrating that we don't have business systems in place that allow transparency and that allow wise choices in terms of the expenditure of dollars. In a hearing yesterday in the Armed Services Committee, I talked with the head of the Navy and the Marines about a system they are putting in place to track equipment. Good idea; right? We want to track equipment. The Army is also putting in a system to track equipment. Here is the rub. They share equipment. You might think these two systems will be able to talk to each other. Oh, no, they have been done separately. They do not talk to each other. It is different software. We are going to have to spend more money for a mechanism so the two systems' tracking equipment—sometimes the equipment they are sharing—can see what is going on. By the way, each of these systems is billions of dollars. We could save billions of dollars by saying to the Army and to the Marines: Use the same software. Use the same program.

That is the kind of savings we can find in the Pentagon if we just look at the GAO high-risk list. The Air Force has been trying for years to put resource management software in place. They are saying they can't even get there until 2017. Are you kidding?

We have to be more efficient with the dollars we spend at the Pentagon, and we will not be if we always say yes and we never say no. There will be no incentive to find savings or to find more jointness among our different military branches in terms of administrative costs if we always say yes and never say no. So the pain has to be felt at the Pentagon too. We cannot do this without pain being felt at the Pentagon.

It has to be across the board, it has to be more substantial than $6.5 billion, and we all have to be willing to compromise.

I will be voting no on both proposals for that reason, but I am anxious to sit down, I am anxious to sit down at the table and find those compromises.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. I wish to make real cuts and move forward in a responsible way to show the American people we get it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the two budget bills we will be voting on shortly that purport to cut spending in Washington. I appreciate the comments of my good friend from Missouri, Senator MCCASKILL, in pointing out many of the shortcomings of the two pieces of legislation.

I am here to deliver a eulogy. Both bills are dead, and they deserve to be dead. One bill cuts too little; the other bill has too much hate. Neither one is serious. Most important, neither will pass, and they shouldn't pass because they are unfair. They are not in the best interests of Nebraskans and taxpayers across our country. About the only thing they are serious about is guaranteeing shutting down the government.

Nebraskans want serious spending cuts, but these bills are loaded with tricks, treats, gimmicks, and games. On one side, we see a bill that simply cuts too little. It purports to cut spending by $50 billion, but when you push through the thicket of gimmicks, it actually only cuts about $6 billion. In a budget of more than $1 trillion, a cut of about one-half percent isn't enough. It will not get runaway government spending under control, nor will it begin to bring down that unsustainable national debt that endangers America's future. To win my support, there needs to be more cuts in spending and they need to be real and reasonable.

That brings me to the other bill. The other bill is H.R. 1. It is chock-full of provisions pushing a political agenda snuck into the bill in the middle of the night. One provision is an attack on America's farmers. It aims to block allowing the use of more American-made ethanol in our cars and trucks. Today, cars and trucks can use gas with 10 percent ethanol. The government has just approved a 15-percent ethanol blend. There is no cost, but that didn't stop some from sneaking in an unfair ban.

Cutting back on ethanol at a time when gas prices are above $3.50 a gallon nationwide, and rising fast, is the wrong thing to do. Worse, it is a gift to foreign oil. Looking at all the violence and turmoil we are seeing on TV in a key oil-producing region of the world, it seems the worst possible gift at the worst possible time.

Another political agenda item in H.R. 1 will eliminate public television in Nebraska—an educational resource for our citizens and an informational lifeline in many parts of Nebraska.

This bill makes other sneaky attempts to push a political agenda. It eliminates poison control centers, blocks a consumer database people might use to determine a product's safety, and keeps high-speed Internet service out of rural areas.

H.R. 1 also limits urban homeland security funds and sets the limit arbitrarily at 25 cities. That will likely bar any future funding to the largest city in my State. While some might not think of Omaha as a terror target, let me tell you it is the home to the U.S. Strategic Command, a major national telecommunications hub, and is a key rail and highway crossroads for freight and transportation.

On the spending side, the House bill makes unfair cuts to the States, including mine, that will cost Nebraskans hundreds of jobs and, indeed, unnecessary hardship. For example, more than 1,200 Nebraska children would lose access to Head Start, which has proven to help students complete high school. The bill cuts Pell tuition grants that 43,000 Nebraskans need to afford college.

In addition, the $75 million cut for homeless veterans' housing vouchers seems absurd. To quote the Director of the Omaha Veterans Hospital: ''This is a very big deal for those veterans and the community.'' This could impact 10,000 homeless veterans nationwide. In Omaha alone, 240 veterans have used these vouchers, and there are likely 600 more who need this help to find permanent housing.

After all is said and done, the bottom line is Washington hasn't gotten serious. I will not be held accountable for the failings of the House and the Senate.

I can, however, be held accountable for 1 of the 12 spending bills that fund the government. As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Legislative Branch Subcommittee, I have the responsibility to oversee the spending bill for Congress. We cut spending last year, we are cutting spending by 5 percent this year, and we will be back for more cuts next year.

Last year, Senator MURKOWSKI and I did this before all the campaign-style speeches about cutting began. It was clear she didn't bring a political agenda to the table, and I hope she knows I didn't either. This year, in working with Senator HOEVEN—also a former Governor, as I am—who is now ranking member on the subcommittee, I have every reason to believe he also will be serious and fair as we reduce spending in next year's budget.

Cutting the spending for Congress—for our offices, committees and staff, our buildings, our police—and our efforts on this Hill is an effort to lead by example. Our committee's bipartisan example could serve as a model for how the other 11 spending bills are handled. Our message, to paraphrase Harry Truman, is: The buck shrinks here.

Soon, we will vote on the two spending bills. One has done nothing to attract Republicans; the other has done nothing to attract Democrats. In the end, we have bills that will divide. They do not unite Congress. For the reasons I have given, I will vote against both.

Then what is next? Washington needs to put aside all the games and gimmicks, the treats and tricks, and come together and do what is right for the American people by passing the budget. They deserve it, they are owed it, and it is now time.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, this debate today is all about jobs. The House Republican budget which we will soon be voting on in this body will destroy 700,000 American jobs. That is the estimate put forward by Mark Zandi, who advised JOHN MCCAIN's Presidential campaign and now works for the nonpartisan Moody's Group.

That sort of estimate is not just a voice in the wilderness, it is repeated by major group after major group. Ben Bernanke, Chairman of the Fed, said last week the plan would cost ''a couple hundred thousand jobs.'' Goldman Sachs analyst Alec Phillips put forth an estimate that said ''this House job-killing plan will reduce, in the second and third quarters of the next year, the economy of the United States by 1.5 to 2 percentage points.''

What is 2 percent of a $15 trillion economy? It is $300 billion.

Whether you view it in terms of the gross domestic product or you view it in terms of the number of jobs of Americans taken away by the job-killing Republican plan, this bill, H.R. 1, that we will be voting on later today, is a disaster.

I want us to focus on this number because I can tell you, folks back home in Oregon want to create jobs. They want us to put America back to work. They don't want to have a plan put forward that continues to pay enormous bonuses to the billionaires of Wall Street and creates enormous special tax bonuses for the billionaires who are making their tax returns while taking out this huge economic meltdown on working people.

Let's review how this all came to pass. You will recall that during the second Bush administration there was a plan to launch two foreign wars and not pay for them, and then proceed to create Medicare Part D and not pay for it, and then to give bonus tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires and not pay for it, and reverse an enormous annual surplus and turn it into an enormous annual deficit and, in the process, produce a very tiny, modest expansion, in which working people actually lost ground. That expansion all went to the very top.

That was just the beginning, before my colleagues across the aisle decided they are going to deregulate retail mortgages in order to ramp up predatory mortgages, produce a huge balloon

in the real estate market, deregulate Wall Street so they could proceed to securitize those mortgages and have those blow up in financial institutions across America and have the economy melt down in 2008–2009. That is how we got where we are right now.

Rather than take on a plan that creates jobs in America, the plan is to eliminate 700,000 jobs across this country.

Let's be clear. There is a tremendous amount we can do to reduce the deficit. A plan was put forward a few weeks ago in which we get rid of those bonus breaks for those who are in the top 2 percent of this country. It saves about $250 billion a year in real hard cash. The plan has been put forward to get rid of the tax breaks for the oil and gas industry which was doing very well and is doing even better now with the oil market speculators driving it up to over $100 a barrel. These things actually close the deficit. They do not destroy the economy. They actually create the sort of plan that can create jobs across this Nation and put people back to work and invest in the future of our Nation rather than saying—after we blew up the economy—let's make working people do even worse.

I am going to summarize by saying embedded in H.R. 1 is attack after attack. For example, taking on preventive health care, preventive health care for women across this country by taking out title X.

How about the attack on homeless veterans? I go throughout my State and folks say: A lot of our sons and daughters are coming home from Iraq and Afghanistan and we need to support them in the transition back home. It is very difficult, there is a lot of post-traumatic stress. Instead of supporting them, my colleagues across the aisle have produced a plan that says let's take away that support for housing for the homeless, housing for veterans.

I could go on because the list is so long and the attacks are so many. But that option, while it does only a modest amount in the short term to affect the deficit, proceeds to have devastating results on the economy. And what will happen when the economy will collapse again, a double-dip recession courtesy of H.R. 1? Then the debt goes back up, so it is a loss on both fronts. We need a responsible plan to reduce the deficit, not a plan to bomb the economy on the heads of our working Americans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, will you kindly advise me when I have 10 minutes left, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will do so.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about where we find ourselves. Nobody has spent more time in the last 6½ years on this floor talking about the problem in front of us. Hopefully I can do that in a way that would never impugn the motives of my fellow Senators.

I enjoyed the speech of the Senator from Nebraska, because one of the things he stated is we have to come together. You are not going to get coming together when we have the speech we just heard, when you have a speech that impugns the motives of the people in the other body trying to solve some of our problems.

The first point I wish to make is we are at a place where we are going to vote on two bills with no amendments. Since when did the Senate give up its ability to try to amend bills going forward? The reason we are not is because, had we not agreed to it, the tree would have been filled and we would have either voted for cloture or not to have cloture, but the fact is in this body we ought to be about amending what we do not like in the bills.

If the Senator from Oregon does not like what is in the bills, he ought to have a chance to try to change it. Yet we find ourselves with a very short period of time to debate what is the No. 1 risk for us as a nation today.

I have read all the economic studies that have been put out on H.R. 1. I have also read what the economists on the other side say in terms of the false assumptions that have been made in it. I don't know which ones are right, but the fact is we are not going to have an actual debate on advancing amendments.

Let me describe where we are today, so everybody knows. We are adding $4.507 billion to the deficit every day. We are borrowing in the international market $3 billion a day. By the time I finish this talk, we will have added $98 million to the deficit. Adding something to the deficit, what does that mean? That is the same thing as saying we are taking the opportunity away from the children and the generation that follows us by putting them in debtors prison. That is exactly what we have done.

I don't care where the blame lies. What we have to start doing is not spending money we do not have. We cannot continue to spend money we do not have. It is very interesting that a week ago this morning, this past Monday, the GAO issued a report. It covers one-third of the Federal Government and lists the duplications they found. We asked them to do that with the last debt limit extension in the Federal Government.

According to my calculations, there is at least $100 billion that is not touched by either of these bills that could be eliminated tomorrow and saved against our children's future. We do not have an opportunity to offer amendments to do that on this bill. Here is real data compiled by the Government Accountability Office where multitudes of Members from this body have called me and said how do we help you do that?

The first way you help me do that is make sure we have an open process on the floor where we can offer an amendment to do it. Let me highlight for a minute some of the things that were in this wonderful report put forward by the GAO.

We have 47 job training programs across 9 different agencies that we are spending $18 billion a year on. Not one of them has a metric on whether it is successful or actually is accomplishing what it is supposed to do. Why do we need so many different job training programs? Why do we need any job training program if we cannot show it is working? Why are we spending money on a job training program that is not working?

We have five departments, eight agencies, two dozen Presidential appointees who oversee our work on bioterrorism. We don't have one agency responsible for it, one group of people. We are spending $6.5 billion a year on bioterrorism and the right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing.

We have 20 agencies and 56 programs dedicated to teaching America financial literacy. We have no moral authority to teach anybody financial literacy when we have a deficit that is going to be $1.65 trillion this year and we are $14.2 trillion in debt.

We have 80 economic development programs across 4 different agencies where we spend $6.5 billion a year. We don't know if they are working. Maybe they are but we ought to know it before we spend money we don't have on things when we do not know if they are working.

We have 15 different agencies covering 30 food safety laws—15 different agencies.

We have 18 nutrition programs, separate nutrition programs. We spend $62.5 billion a year, $30 billion of it is borrowed, and we do not know the results. Why shouldn't we have one? And why shouldn't we put a metric on it to know whether it is working?

We have 20 homeless programs. We heard mentioned the homeless programs. We are going to spend $2.9 billion at seven different agencies, and if you add up the money over the last 10 years that we spent on homeless programs we can buy every homeless person in this country a $200,000 home. Yet we continue to spend money. We don't know if the programs are working. They certainly would be better off if they had $200,000 for their care for the future rather than continue the programs we have no metrics on.

We have 82 teacher training quality programs—82 of them. They are across 10 different Federal Government agencies and we spend $4 billion a year on them and we have no idea whether they are successful. As a matter of fact, we do know if they are successful—we are not successful in our country today. Are we getting value for what we are spending? Remember, 40 cents of every dollar we spend on these programs we are borrowing from the Chinese.

We have 52 programs for entrepreneurial efforts. Since when is that a

role of the Federal Government? We have 35 programs to oversee infrastructure; 27 different programs for commercial buildings; 28 programs to oversee new markets outside of this country—28 programs; 20 programs for business incubators, and 17 different grant programs for disaster preparedness. We have 17 different grant programs for disaster preparedness; 34 areas where Federal agencies, offices, or programs have redundant objectives or are fragmented across several departments; 2,100 data centers for 24 agencies. Consolidating them could save $200 billion over a decade. We cannot even offer that amendment on this debate. That is $20 billion a year. That is a third of what the House wants to save.

We have the ability—there is the waste, there is the incompetency in what Congress has done through its duplication of efforts and its lack of oversight—to solve a great portion of our fiscal problems.

We can do it. But we cannot do it when the process does not allow for debate and votes on those specific issues. I want to talk for a minute about what is ahead of us as a nation because I think it is important. I am very sorry my friend, President Obama, has not led on this issue.

Let me tell you what is in front of us. What is in front of us is rising interest rates. What is in front of us is rising competition for capital to fund our deficits. The historic rate for us on our debt as a nation over the last 35 years has been greater than 6 percent. Last year we paid less than 2 percent for what we have on the books, less than 2 percent average.

Our historical timeframe on when that money is due is usually about 10-plus years. We are now financing that at 59 months. What is going to happen in the world next year? Well, the difference in terms of sovereign financing—that is, other countries that also need to borrow money, including us—and what is available to finance that next year is $7 trillion. In other words, there is a $7 trillion shortfall in terms of what is going to be available to finance.

If we are going to borrow $7 trillion in the world more than what is available, what do we think is going to happen to interest rates? What is going to happen? Well, they are going to rise. So we are going to be faced with one of the following two dilemmas unless Congress gets its act together. Here are the two dilemmas: The first is, our average interest cost goes back to its historical cost. If that happens, immediately we are going to see $640 billion more a year in interest costs—$640 billion. We only have less than $200 billion this year. We are going to see a $640 billion increase. That does not help any person who has a need. All that does is that is paid out to our debtors. That is a very real risk for us right now.

That goes to say that we do not have a lot of time because what we know is interest rates are going to rise. So it is mandatory that Congress do what the American people have known for a while we need to do; that is, live within our means.

Now, let me describe the second problem or second solution; that is, what the Federal Reserve will do. The Federal Reserve will just print more money. Well, if we print more money and we do not have any base for doing that, that creates what is called inflation. It is called debasing our currency.

What happens in America if we decide that the way we are going to get out of our problem is to debase our currency and print more money, like the Fed is doing right now, what is called quantitative easing 2?

They are printing $600 billion worth of money between now and June. Well, what happens is the value of everything we own in real terms declines, in nominal dollars goes up, but the purchasing power of the average middle-class family in this country declines tragically, and the safety net this country has been known for, for those who are far less fortunate than the average American, will be absolutely unaffordable, totally unaffordable. So we are talking about the destruction of the best of America, our middle class. We are talking about taking opportunities away.

So what is the answer? The answer is not to have more partisan statements by Senator MERKLEY impugning the motives of people who are trying to do what is right even though it is different from his opinion. The answer is for Congress to get together and recognize the threat to our future and give up long-held positions to solve the greater good. That means we have to move. That means we have to recognize that we cannot have it all our way.

How do we actually do that? Well, the one failure of Congress, in my time in Congress, both in the House in the mid-1990s and now in the Senate since 2004, is we do not do oversight. How did we end up with this report that shows $100 billion in duplications? The only way it could happen is we were not watching. We were not doing the oversight.

So one of the things that needs to happen is the chairman of every committee ought to spend 90 percent of their time in oversight on things we are already doing rather than working on creating new bills and new programs.

Second, what ought to happen is we ought to have a vigorous debate with amendments on the floor of the Senate to solve some of the very real problems. It is not all that hard to solve these problems. But what happens is in partisan bodies, people talk past one another. Nobody would decline the fact that we ought to get rid of unused property. We can save $8 billion a year if we get rid of unused Federal property. Does anybody disagree with that? But we have not done it. There is $8 billion. We are going to get out of this $1.6 trillion hole a couple billion dollars at a time. We ought to do that. We ought to get rid of the wasteful printing at the Government Printing Office, save several hundred million dollars over the next 10 years.

We ought to quit paying bonuses to contractors who do not do their job—and we have documented that multiple agencies are doing that—performance bonuses when they do not meet the performance requirements.

We ought to collect the unpaid taxes from Federal employees; it is $3 billion. Those are the settled claims; these are not the unsettled claims.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN.) The Chair notifies the Senator he has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. COBURN. I thank the Chair. Here is a list of ideas that comes to $380 billion, of things that we would, as normal Americans sitting at our family table, say: You are in trouble. Forty percent of your budget you are spending you do not have the money for. Your credit cards are maxed out. You cannot do it. What can we spend? Here it is.

There were 72 amendments last year. Two of them passed the Senate. I heard the Senator from Nebraska talking about some pain that might occur in his district. I want to tell you, there has to be shared pain all across the country if we are going to get out of the problem we are in. We can no longer kick the can down the road without spilling the soup all over our kids. The time for action is now. The time for leadership is now.

If we look at history, what we find is the average age of a republic is 207 years. All republics before us have failed. How have they failed? What is it that caused them to lose their economy and their freedom? Was it an invading army? Was it some natural disaster? None of those things. If we go back in history, every one that has failed has failed over fiscal issues, the very issues that confront us today.

I think it is time America cheats history. I think it is time we come together and solve these big problems. It is going to be painful for everyone.

It means some Senators are going to lose their seats if they do the best, right thing for America. There cannot be a greater calling than that, to do the best, right thing for our country. It means following a pattern of leadership that says personal sacrifice by me in a leadership position has to come first, demonstrating my ability to understand the problem.

So we are going to have a limited debate on two bills, both imperfect. But certainly one of them goes more toward the problem that we have than the other. We are going to spend $3.8 trillion this year through September 30. The deficit is going to be $1.6 trillion.

The savings from the House cut is this little, bitty green line down here. It is only $57 billion. The savings from INOUYE is $4.7. You cannot even see a line. It does not begin to address the duplication, the waste, the fraud and abuse, the incompetence of what we have created in the Federal Government. It will not solve our problems.

It will be a nice starting point for partisan debate, but it takes us away from what we need to do. Here is the cut. Here is the deficit. This is a pie chart. It is showing—it is nothing—$57 billion is nothing. What we have to do to be able to compete in a world financial market is send a signal that we get what the problem is, that we are willing to make the difficult and tough sacrifices and choices to become viable and reliable and have people loan us money in the future. We have to extend the term and period of our debt where we buy the time to make these things possible so the least amount of pain—although very real—comes about.

For goodness' sake, we have to stop spending money we do not have on things we do not absolutely need.

I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague. As Congress tries to get serious about cutting wasteful and reckless spending, I believe taxpayer subsidy of abortion providers should be among the first things to go. I personally believe it is morally wrong to end an innocent human life through abortion. I also believe it is morally reprehensible to take the dollars of millions of pro-life Americans in order to fund organizations that do that. That is a view held by the great majority of Americans. Americans should not be forced to subsidize abortion, much less fund our Nation's largest abortion provider, Planned Parenthood.

When the House passed its continuing resolution before us today, it adopted a provision that cuts funding to this abortion giant, and it did it with significant bipartisan support. Unfortunately, that language was stripped by Senate leadership behind closed doors. But I believe Senators should have a chance to vote directly on that measure following a full and open debate.

Again, I do not personally believe abortion is a right guaranteed by the Constitution. I believe that it is morally wrong. But this issue is even beyond that. This is not about abortion on demand in this country. This debate is about whether taxpayer dollars, including those billions of taxpayer dollars from pro-life Americans, should be sent to organizations such as Planned Parenthood, which performs millions of abortions in this country.

According to their latest annual report, Planned Parenthood boasted more than $363 million in taxpayer funding, $363 million. By the way, that is the same year it performed an unprecedented 324,008 abortions. Every year since 2000 the government has increased taxpayer funding of Planned Parenthood, on average over a $22 million-a-year increase. And guess what. The number of abortions Planned Parenthood has performed has also steadily increased, even though the overall abortion rate in the United States has declined since 2008.

Planned Parenthood's abortion rate massively outpaces its adoption referrals. In 2008, a woman entering a Planned Parenthood clinic was 134 times more likely to have an abortion than to be referred for an adoption.

Planned Parenthood has also made a profit every year since 1987, including over a $63 million return profit in 2009. There is no justification for subsidizing Planned Parenthood's profit-making venture with taxpayer dollars.

There has been a recent onslaught of ads that claim Planned Parenthood is simply a leading provider of women's health services. But abortions, not other health services, not true health services—abortions account for roughly one-third of the $1 billion income generated by its affiliated clinics.

Let me be clear. This provision would not cut all title X funding for health services such as breast cancer screenings, HIV testing, counseling, valuable family planning services. It would simply block funds, taxpayer dollars, from subsidizing America's largest abortion provider. That has the support of the American people, even well beyond America's prolife numbers. I believe the sanctity of human life is a principle that Congress should proclaim at every opportunity. Again, this goes even beyond that.

The time has come to respect the wishes of the great majority of Americans, pro-life and many pro-choice, who say using taxpayer dollars to fund huge abortion providers—Planned Parenthood is the biggest—simply is not right. We have to cut. We have to get responsible. This is certainly a key place to start.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to address the Senate on the consequences of where we are in the debate on appropriations and the harsh and punitive consequences of H.R. 1. However, I cannot let the comments made during the last half hour go unchallenged.

First, I wish to comment on the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma on duplication in government. I so respect the Senator from Oklahoma. We have worked on many fiscal reform issues. But he went over a list, program by program by program, of where he says we have duplication. I don't challenge his facts, but I do challenge his inertia. If these programs have been in existence and have been duplicative and denied value to the taxpayer, where has he been? The Republicans were in charge for 10 years, from 2000 to 2008. They were in charge of all three branches of the government. So if he didn't like duplication, they had the Presidency, the House, and they had the Senate. Why didn't they change it? Now all of a sudden they have religion. I don't know what faith that is, but they now have the desire to talk about it. If they were serious about ending duplication, it should have started a long time ago.

Second, bring the ideas forth, look for cosponsors from other reform-minded people such as the Presiding Officer and myself. Let's end the duplication. But let's end the duplicity and in the way we talk about duplication. I am tired of blaming Barack Obama, who has been President for 2 years, for everything that is perceived as wrong with the United States. Where were they?

I must credit the Senator from Oklahoma. He has often brought fiscal folly to the attention of the Senate. I was with him when we fought lavish meatballs at $4 and $7 apiece that he found. When he showed it to me, I joined with him in the reform package. I loved it, and I look forward to working with him. But don't act holier than thou now about duplication.

Now let's go to the abortion topic. I will not change this conversation into the ''A'' word. However, the Senator talked about Planned Parenthood being profit making. It cannot be. It is a nonprofit. I am not even going to argue additional revenue. He doesn't want to give money to Planned Parenthood because they make a profit. I won't debate him on that. But the next time he supports an oil subsidy, I am going to oppose it because the oil companies make a profit. I am going to fight tooth and nail to end the lavish subsidies we give on oil and gas. If we are not going to give it to Planned Parenthood because they make money, then I will not support giving it to oil companies because they make money. So there. I have said it, and I am proud of it.

This is no laughing matter, what we are dealing with on appropriations. H.R. 1 will have a Draconian effect on the middle class and a Draconian effect on jobs. Our economy is very fragile. We are barely making a recovery. If we pass H.R. 1, we will place our Nation at risk because of the impact of the cuts on those who really do protect America.

It will further pummel the middle class. I am not going to stand for further pummeling of the middle class.

I am not just a Senator from Maryland. Like the Presiding Officer, I am a Senator for Maryland. If we take a look at what H.R. 1 does, it really whacks at Maryland's middle-class families. It cuts job training, education and access to higher education, much-needed childcare and afterschool programs. Right this very minute, if H.R. 1 passed, we would have people lose their Pell grants. A tremendous number of Marylanders would lose their Pell grants, not only numerically but their grant would be cut by over $500. For a lot of people, that is the money that helps buy textbooks, pays the lab fees so they can go on to be a lab tech or a cyber tech in the new economy.

Let's take a look at the children. They talked about the right to life. I am for a right to life after one is born. I think after one is born, they ought to have a shot. I respect their position. They have to respect ours. Under their Draconian cuts, 2,471 Maryland children would lose Head Start opportunities. Head Start is what gets them learning ready so they can take advantage of our public schools and move on in life. Let's have it for these little children.

Then there are those who say we need to compete. I want to compete too in the global marketplace. So what does that mean? It means we have to fund NIH. Under H.R. 1, NIH will be cut $1 billion. In cancer screening alone, 36,000 Marylanders will lose that opportunity, and 5 million will lose it nationwide. If we look at program after program and how it affects women and children and access to education, we are the net losers. If we are going to out-educate and out-innovate, we cannot pass H.R. 1, which takes me to why it is bad for Maryland jobs. We have the great honor of representing iconic Federal institutions: the National Institutes of Health, the National Institute of Standards, Goddard Space Agency, Goddard and Hopkins Space Telescope Institute, home to the great Hubbell telescope which serves the world in what it does. The fact is, it takes people to work there. If we do these Draconian cuts, it will have a tremendous impact. But I am not talking about only government jobs. I am talking about private sector jobs.

If H.R. 1 passes, we will lose a tremendous amount in Community Development Block Grant money. We will lose $11 million in Community Development Block Grant money. So whether one is in Baltimore City, making its comeback under Mayor Stephanie Rawlings, or in a small rural county, it could result in 1,000 jobs being lost in construction where we could be creating new housing and new opportunities for economic development. The Speaker of the House says if it is going to cost jobs, so be it. Well, so be it is not OK with me.

If we look at transportation alone, the cuts in transportation will cause Maryland to lose close to $100 million to fix highways, byways, beltways, the kinds of things we need to do that deal with congestion and will save lives because we will have safer roads, and create jobs in construction. That is over 3,157 Maryland jobs. Those are private sector construction jobs.

The Presiding Officer and I have visited our great Maryland biotech companies. They have NIH doing the basic research. They value add it, and then they go to FDA. FDA makes sure our prescription drugs are safe. When they have the FDA brand of approval, we can sell them anywhere in the world. But under these cuts, we are going to eliminate 5,000 jobs. What that means is, we are going to further set back the backlog in order to get a biotech, a pharmaceutical or a medical device approved. So it is going to cost us jobs in government in Maryland at FDA, but it is also going to cost jobs in the private sector in the biotech field, the medical device field, and the pharmaceutical field.

Right now the Social Security Administration—the people who calculate and make sure the checks go out on time to the right person—is facing possible layoffs and furloughs. We are facing nationwide an immediate possibility of furloughs of 3,500 people. What does that mean? The checks will go out, yes. But that means if one is applying for a benefit, they are going to wait a long time. If they have any kind of disability, the backlog could increase to as much as 3 to 4 years. They can't apply for Social Security disability. If they are applying for disability, it means they are too sick to work. So we are going to lay off the very people who make sure our checks are developed in a timely way.

I have more to say, and I will say it as the debate continues. But if we pass H.R. 1, it is a job-killing, middle-class pummeling bill that I am going to vote no on and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I also wish to discuss the Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies, CJS, in the Senate Continuing Resolution, CR.

CJS in the Inouye CR totals $53.6 billion, which is $6.9 billion or 11 percent below the President's request for FY 2011. This is in contrast to the House Republican CR, which is $900 million lower. I support the Inouye CR and oppose the House Republican CR because it would undermine our ability to outeducation, outinnovate, and outbuild the rest of the world.

Make no mistake, the Inouye CR makes painful cuts, and further cuts will hurt even more. I would like my colleagues to know I will go no more. I am finished cutting.

Under the Inouye CR, CJS cuts $420 million from state and local law enforcement grants, a 7 percent cut to every grant program, including COPS hiring grants, Byrne grants, grants for bulletproof vests for police officers who walk the thin blue line, and grants to reduce the backlog of DNA evidence.

The CR terminates the Weed and Seed program, which helps local communities fight gangs and crime. State and local law enforcement agencies will lose Federal funding they need during a time of austerity in their own budgets.

Federal law enforcement is funded at substantially below the President's request in this CR. Specifically, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, FBI, is $500 million below President's request, and the Drug Enforcement Agency, DEA, is $110 million below President's request. The hiring freeze will continue. Vacant positions won't be filled—not just in headquarters—but in our local communities where agents are partners in fighting drugs and crime, and tracking down sexual predators who prey on our children.

The CR provides $6.3 billion for Bureau of Prisons salaries and expenses, which is $245.5 million below the President's FY 2011 budget request. Prisons will continue to have serious and dangerous overcrowding, putting the safety of our prison guards at risk.

The Justice Department's core capabilities will also be degraded. The CR cuts $216 million from internal technology upgrades that are supposed to give the Department better financial management and accountability, and better communications with State and local law enforcement.

This CR cuts the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, by $943 million. This cut will jeopardize efforts to fix ongoing problems with the development of NOAA's polar satellites by not providing new funding for the Joint Polar Satellite System. This could lead to a gap in weather forecasting data that the military and our private sector rely upon.

The cuts in this CR will already halt plans to pump funds into scientific research and discovery that leads to innovation and economic growth, and education programs that build the next generation of scientists and innovators. Specifically, it cuts the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by $461 million, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, by $165 million and the National Science Foundation, NSF, by $573 million. NASA will continue to follow the authorizing bill with new path forward for human spaceflight, but the Agency won't be able to initiate new space technology programs. NIST will not have funding for new Technology Innovation Partnership, TIP, grants or for competitive science building construction. NSF will be halted on its path to doubling.

While the CR gives the Patent and Trademark Office full access to fees paid by inventors, it cuts the International Trade Administration, ITA, $93 million less than the fiscal year 2011 requested level. This will delay efforts to boost the economy and create jobs by helping more U.S. farmers, manufacturers, and service providers sell their products overseas.

We made many responsible cuts in the CR. It eliminates the $48 million Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee program, which has not made a loan since 2003, and cuts $44 million from the Census, eliminating duplicative and overlapping analysis performed by other agencies or issued in other ways by Census. The Inouye CR also eliminates one time construction projects at the FBI, the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms, and the U.S. Marshals Service.

Even with all that, we are being asked to do more. How much more is it responsible to cut? I want my colleagues to know, I am done cutting.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I was concerned over what the effect of H.R. 1 would be on Medicare beneficiaries. I wrote a letter to HHS Secretary Sebelius asking that question, what effect passage of H.R. 1 would have on Medicare beneficiaries. I got the answer a couple days ago. Frankly, it spent a couple days going through the White House, OMB, and so forth, but I received the letter last night. What does that letter say?

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPT. OF HEALTH & HUMAN SVCS.,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2011.

Hon. MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In a recent letter, you asked specifically how Medicare and Medicaid would be affected if the House-passed version of H.R. 1 were enacted. Sections 4016 and 4018 of H.R. 1 would preclude use of Continuing Resolution (CR) funds for implementing or carrying out provisions of the Affordable Care Act.

The Affordable Care Act modifies and improves almost every Medicare payment system—including the inpatient hospital prospective payment system, the outpatient hospital prospective payment system, the physician fee schedule, Medicare Advantage plan payments, and prescription drug plan payments. If H.R.1 were enacted, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) would not be able to use CR funds to administer payments based on any rate calculated on the basis of the provisions of the Affordable Care Act—which is to say virtually all rates.

Where the Affordable Care Act effectively repealed prior payment methodologies and replaced them with new ones, H.R. 1 would seem to preclude any payments for the items or services at issue. For example, the Affordable Care Act replaced the old statutory provisions governing payments to Medicare Advantage (MA) organizations with new provisions, including a freeze in payment levels in 2011. Using CR funds to make payments to MA organizations under the new Affordable Care Act provisions would be prohibited by H.R. 1. Moreover, there would not appear to be legal authority to pay MA organizations under the prior payment methodology, given that this methodology was repealed in the Affordable Care Act. This would seem to mean that payments to MA organizations would have to be suspended, risking a significant disruption in services to beneficiaries enrolled in Medicare Advantage.

In the event that any prior payment methodologies that have not been fully repealed by the Affordable Care Act could be decoupled from all of the additions to the Medicare statute made by the Affordable Care Act, CMS would have to perform extensive analyses to determine whether it could permissibly make payments of some sort. But, even if CMS could do so, it would be required to undertake rulemaking to establish new rates under each payment system, as the existing rates are all in some way dependent on Affordable Care Act authorities. The promulgation of each new rule could take several months to complete. While the new rates were implemented, CMS would be prohibited from paying providers and suppliers at the Affordable Care Act rates.

In a system where millions of claims are paid each week, millions of claims would accumulate, which CMS and its contractors would be prohibited from paying at the Affordable Care Act rates. At the point at which claims could begin to be paid at the new rates, it would take many months and significant resources to process the backlog—resources that H.R. 1 would not provide. As a result, providers and suppliers, many of which are small businesses—and, ultimately, beneficiaries—would experience significant disruption.

In addition to changes in Medicare payment methodologies, beginning this year, the Affordable Care Act authorizes Medicare to cover annual ''wellness visits'' for beneficiaries and waives coinsurance and deductibles for critical preventive services. Claims could no longer be paid for any of these benefits using CR funds, as payments for these benefits are authorized only by the Affordable Care Act.

Many of the provisions in the Affordable Care Act are aimed at slowing the growth rate of spending increases and improving health care for beneficiaries through innovative health service delivery reforms and value-based purchasing. None of these reforms—such as hospital value-based purchasing; payment incentives for reductions of hospital-acquired conditions; and the care transitions program for high-risk Medicare beneficiaries—could be implemented using CR funds.

H.R. 1 would adversely affect health care in rural areas as well. As an example, as a means to encourage physicians to provide services in rural areas, the Affordable Care Act established a new 10 percent bonus payment for primary care services furnished by primary care practitioners and for major surgical procedures furnished by general surgeons in shortage areas. Without available CR funding, CMS would no longer be able to provide the bonus to primary care and general surgery physicians for eligible services.

The Affordable Care Act also gives CMS new tools to fight fraud and helps us move from a pay-and-chase system to a comprehensive prevention-focused strategy. By precluding the use of CR funds for such efforts, H.R. 1 would substantially impede CMS's proven and successful efforts to reduce fraud and waste in the health care system, resulting in increased erroneous payments. H.R. 1 would effectively require CMS to cease enforcing new screening and enrollment standards, diminish CMS's ability to suspend payments when credible allegations of fraud are uncovered, and reduce resources that have been made available for investments in anti-fraud work.

The Affordable Care Act also provided States with a number of opportunities to compete for federal grants and expand eligibility and services for Medicaid beneficiaries at little or no cost to States. Among these are: funding for States to provide incentives to prevent chronic diseases in Medicaid beneficiaries, increased federal funding to provide preventive services for eligible adults in Medicaid, and enhanced funding to assist in providing health homes to Medicaid beneficiaries. Under H.R. 1, CR funds could not be used in furtherance of any of these provisions.

The Affordable Care Act also includes numerous other policies to make health care more affordable, accessible, and accountable for seniors, individuals with disabilities, children, and all other Americans, as well as businesses large and small. Its improvements are already woven into the fabric of our health care system. A broad prohibition on the use of CR funds would work to seriously impair or even halt the operation of the Early Retiree Reinsurance Program; the Pre-existing Condition Insurance Plan; and the health insurance rate review, consumer assistance, and Exchange grant programs.

I hope this information is helpful. We would be happy to answer any additional questions.

Sincerely,

KATHLEEN SEBELIUS,

Mr. BAUCUS. According to the Secretary of HHS, the consequences for Medicare beneficiaries of H.R. 1 are dire, to say the least. I don't have the calculations for the number of Medicare beneficiaries who would be affected nationwide, but I can give my colleagues the effect it would have on Montana, and that way they can extrapolate that into what the effect would be nationwide.

Essentially, according to the Secretary's letter, she says that because the health care reform bill repealed certain provisions in Medicare and then replaced them with other provisions to address quality and help provide better health care especially for seniors, that H.R. 1, because it repeals the provisions in the health care law put in place to provide benefits for seniors, would have the effect of cutting health care to seniors.

For example, essentially the House amendment would eliminate private Medicare coverage under Medicare Advantage. That is the effect of H.R. 1. If one is a Medicare recipient under a Medicare Advantage plan, under H.R. 1 they would no longer be allowed to receive benefits.

In my State of Montana, Medicare Advantage covers about 26,000 seniors. That is only the State of Montana. But nationwide, of course, it would be hundreds of thousands, probably close to in the millions of seniors who would no longer be able to benefit under Medicare Advantage. They would be thrown off. That is what the HHS Secretary says.

I will read the significant sentence. I am reading one sentence from the letter, dated March 8:

> This would seem to mean that payments to MA organizations would have to be suspended, risking a significant disruption in services to beneficiaries enrolled in Medicare Advantage.

They would be suspended, according to the interpretation of the HHS Secretary of the effect of H.R. 1 on Medicare beneficiaries.

Second, it would have virtually the same effect with respect to the part D prescription drug benefits; that is, health care reform began to close the doughnut hole. Earlier, seniors received $250 in assistance for prescription drugs. Under the health care reform bill, they would be eligible for a 50-percent discount for brand-name drugs. That, too, would be suspended. That is the effect of H.R. 1—to suspend. Let me see if I can find the operable sentence in the letter. I do not see it at the moment. In a few minutes, I will find it and I will give it to you.

Add to that the payments for preventive benefits. They, too, would be suspended—wellness programs, such as for colonoscopies, mammographies, et cetera. She says ''[c]laims could no

longer be paid for any of these benefits'' as a consequence of H.R. 1.

Add to that rural health care.

Without available CR funding, CMS would no longer be able to provide the bonus to primary care and general surgery physicians for eligible services.

There are other areas. In the nature of fraud prevention, those efforts would be suspended. Of course, some of the proponents who want to kill health care reform do not mind some additional provisions I might mention—namely, moving more toward delivery system reform and toward improving the quality of health care and also reducing costs.

I do not think the authors of H.R. 1 knew what they were doing. I think they were a little quick in writing their legislation. I do not think they realized the effect of H.R. 1 would be to deny Medicare beneficiaries these payments. Especially, I point out that the Medicare beneficiaries, under Medicare Advantage—according to the HHS Secretary, those payments to those persons under Medicare Advantage would have to be suspended.

I have a hunch that if we were to look more deeply into the actual provisions of H.R. 1, we would find other similar consequences. Maybe it would be in the Medicare Program. It might be in some other health care program. But I just asked the Secretary to focus in on the effects to Medicare, and that is the response she gave.

I urge all Senators, please let's not cut Medicare Advantage payments. That is just not the right thing to do. Innocent seniors are getting caught in this crossfire here. I am sure we have to begin to cut Federal spending. There is no question about that. But let's not be so foolhardy and unintelligently cut Medicare beneficiaries the way H.R. 1 does.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Thank you, Mr. President.

I wish to follow up on the comments of the Senators from Montana and Maryland who spoke so eloquently and clearly about the consequences of adopting the House resolution which sets spending levels for the next year.

In my view, a vote for H.R. 1 would be, indeed, a reckless vote because the consequences of such severe cuts in some areas, as outlined particularly by the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Montana, would be, in fact, reckless, and also, as it relates to my subcommittee, which I want to speak about for a moment, the Subcommittee on Homeland Security—not an inconsequential area of our responsibility: protecting the 350-plus million Americans who live in the United States and trust that we are doing our jobs well enough to keep them safe every day from rising threat levels from a variety of different sources. That is what our job is on the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee, and I am going to be voting against H.R. 1 because, in my view, it goes too far, and it puts our homeland in jeopardy.

Let me be clear. In the State of the Union, the President stated that al-Qaida and its affiliates continue to plan attacks against our Nation. He stressed that extremists are trying to inspire acts of violence by those within our borders. According to the Attorney General, in the last 2 years, 126 individuals have been indicted for terrorist-related activities, including 50 of our own citizens.

The Homeland Security Secretary appeared before my subcommittee last week and said that the threat of terrorist attacks is as high as it has been since 9/11. And what do the Republican leaders, just newly minted and elected, come to Washington to do? Slash the homeland security budget. I am not going to do that, and I urge my colleagues not to do that.

In view of these threats, we cannot reduce the homeland security budget to levels that preceded the Christmas Day bombing attempt, the Times Square bombing attempt, the air cargo bombing attempt, and the Fort Hood shooting and before the escalation of violence and drugs along the Mexican border. We had one of our agents gunned down just 3 weeks ago. What does this budget do that they are recommending? Slash border security. We literally spilled blood on this floor, almost, building that fence along the border and adding border security. Now they want to dismantle it? I do not think so.

The bill makes deep cuts in State and local grants to train and equip first responders. Do they think it is going to be the FBI agents who are walking around Times Square every day looking for a smoking car? No. It is going to likely be a local New York firefighter or police officer or a citizen walking by noticing something and calling the police. We have very small—really, relatively small—training grants available. They cut that by over 50 percent. Is that smart? I do not think so.

The House bill cuts border security infrastructure programs when violence in Mexico is at an unprecedented level.

The House bill will cut Coast Guard acquisitions despite a need to recapitalize its aging fleet and when the Coast Guard mission continues to expand, as was so clear not even a year ago, on April 20, when the Deep Horizon exploded. Whom did you call when you went to 911 and said there is a rig on fire? Whom did we call? The Coast Guard. How did they get to the rig? On cutters and boats that we built. What did they do with the Coast Guard budget? They cut it almost below maintenance levels for situations such as this.

The House bill cuts port security and transit security when the Mumbai, London, and Madrid terrorist attacks proved that those sectors are vulnerable. How many more terrorists have to attack trains before we realize there is a level you cannot go beneath without putting our citizens at risk? And we are perilously close to that level.

The House bill reduces Transportation Security Administration procurement for its explosive-detection technologies that TSA needs to respond, as we have developed since the attempted bombing at Christmastime.

Cyber security—I have not even spoken about this. It is very difficult, and some of this is classified information, and it is not something people can really grasp as well as they can understand explosives on trains and airplanes, which is, I guess, easier to visualize.

These attacks through our Internet and through the new interconnecting technologies now that our electric grid and all of our companies depend on need to be countered as well.

Amendment No. 149 addresses these cuts while making responsible cuts in lower priority programs.

The House bill cuts port security grants by 66 percent despite the fact that our ports produce over $3 trillion of economic activity and jobs for 13 million American workers and the Mumbai attacks proved the vulnerability of ports. The Senate bill would maintain the fiscal year 2010 level of $300 million.

H.R. 1 would cut transit security grants by 66 percent, despite the fact that there have been over 1,300 attacks, killing or injuring over 18,000 people worldwide on trains and subways over the last 7 years. The Senate amendment would maintain the fiscal year 2010 level of $300 million.

I say to all of my friends who get on a plane and expect it to be safe that H.R. 1 would cut $562 million from the President's request for the Transportation Security Administration to provide our airports with scanners, screeners, and K–9 teams. Under H.R. 1, funding for the Transportation Security Administration would be below the operating level on December 25, 2009, when a Nigerian terrorist tried to blow up Northwest flight 253 over the United States. As a result, TSA would only be able to purchase 250 additional advanced imaging technology body scanners, instead of the 500 requested, and 415 additional portable explosives trace detection units, instead of the 800 units requested. The Senate Democratic alternative restores these cuts.

H.R. 1 would cut the precise agencies—FEMA, the Coast Guard, and State and local first responders—that are supposed to help us prevent or respond to future disasters. The Senate version restores these cuts.

Under H.R. 1, the Coast Guard would not be able to award production of the fifth National Security Cutter, NSC, delaying the project by a year and driving up costs by $45 to $60 million. The Senate amendment fully funds the $692 million necessary to complete NSC, No. 5. National Security Cutters are replacing the Coast Guard's 40-year-old

fleet of high endurance cutters, which are increasingly unavailable due to equipment breakdowns. The Senate amendment also includes funds to hire 55 additional Coast Guard personnel to improve their capacity to respond to oilspills.

The Senate amendment provides $189 million more than the House bill for the border security agencies—Customs and Border Protection and Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Within that amount, the Senate bill provides $150 million more than the House bill for border security infrastructure and technology, providing our Border Patrol agents with the assets they need to help secure the northern and southern borders. Cuts to border technology made by the House bill would postpone for at least 1 year the procurement, construction, and deployment of new remote video surveillance systems in Arizona and reduce by 50 percent funds available for tactical communications modernization along the Southwest border.

H.R. 1 provides no funding to continue construction of the DHS Headquarters at the St. Elizabeths campus in Washington, DC. Congress has appropriated $1.1 billion for the project, but the House action would leave a half-built building, sitting in the mud. This decision will delay completion of the Coast Guard headquarters by at least 1 year and increase costs by $69 million. The Senate amendment provides $91.4 million to complete the Coast Guard headquarters.

The House bill cuts emergency management performance grants by 12 percent. The events surrounding Hurricanes Katrina and Rita highlighted the critical importance of effective catastrophic all-hazards planning. The Senate amendment maintains the $340 million fiscal year 2010 level.

H.R. 1 would reduce science and technology research and development funding by 69 percent, forgoing critical investments in the next generation of explosives detection systems, chemical and biological weapons detection systems, radiological and nuclear detection systems, as well as sensors and other technologies to help secure the borders. The Senate version reduces funding by only 19 percent, a difficult but responsible reduction.

The House bill makes deep cuts to cyber security, which is unconscionable, since the President has said, ''the cyber threat is one of the most serious economic and national security challenges we face''. The House cuts would delay deployment of the Einstein program—our network intrusion detection and protection program—reducing protection coverage of Federal agency networks by 12 percent, reduce cyber attack response efforts by 25 percent, reduce international collaboration, and reduce our development of advanced tools needed to keep pace with new and evolving cyber threats.

In order to make these restorations, the Senate amendment rescinds over $545 million of low priority unobligated balances and reduces lower priority programs by over $900 million below fiscal year 2010 levels.

My goal is to produce a fiscally responsible Homeland Security bill that provides the Department with the resources it needs to prepare for, respond to, and recover from all threats, both manmade and natural. It is essential that we provide the Department with the resources that it needs to be nimble in preparing for and responding to an evolving threat.

I urge Members to support amendment No. 149 to H.R. 1.

As I said, the House bill, H.R. 1, cuts port security grants by 66 percent, transportation security grants by 66 percent. It cuts FEMA, and it cuts the Coast Guard below levels that are safe.

Homeland Security is the newest agency. I realize we have to make cuts and bring our budget into balance. If this were a plan to get us to a balanced budget, I would support it. But it is not. It is just a plan that jeopardizes our homeland security and does not do very much at all to close that deficit gap. When a real plan is present, I will vote for it. Until then, I am voting no.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the badly misguided budget cuts contained in the legislation the House has sent to us threaten to strangle our fragile economic recovery before it can truly begin. The House bill would weaken the social safety net that helps keep our communities together; it would end education opportunities that give Americans a chance to succeed; it would weaken investments in science and new technologies that we need to make our Nation competitive globally; and it would make our Nation less secure.

Our colleagues in the House have diagnosed a patient with heart disease—and prescribed amputation. Their proposed cure would do little to heal the disease of budget deficits, and in the meantime, do a lot of damage to the patient. They propose to solve our budget woes by slashing nondefense discretionary spending—which makes up a mere 15 percent or so of the Federal budget. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office told us just this week that if we eliminated all nondefense discretionary spending—every last dime of it—we would still run budget deficits by 2016. We cannot solve the budget problem this way, no matter how hard our Republican friends try to convince Americans that we can.

Republicans say we should interpret their drastic, unbalanced and extreme legislation as sending a message on their seriousness about the deficit. But the only message it sends is that they are serious about eroding important programs from Head Start to job training to Pell grants to food inspections to border security.

This legislation would cut $61 million from the Presidential budget request for food inspections, sending the message that we don't need to worry about food safety, despite the thousands of Americans every year who suffer from food-borne illness. It would cut over $1 billion from the Women, Infants and Children Program, sending the message that we should do less to help poor families put food on the table.

Our Republican colleagues are serious about cutting more than $180 million from the Securities and Exchange Commission budget and more than $100 million from the Commodity Futures Trading Commission budget, sending the message that we don't need to put cops on the beat to police financial markets that all too recently devastated our economy.

They are serious about cutting nearly $290 million from Veterans Administration efforts to provide better service to our veterans.

Their bill would cut $1 billion in funding for community health centers, sending the message that health care for citizens who would lose it under this proposal is a secondary concern. They would remove $17 million from the research on immunization and respiratory disease, a message that we can cut back on efforts to fight childhood illness.

Their bill would cut $550 million from the National Science Foundation research budget, and another $1.1 billion from Department of Energy research. It would cut about $900 million from our support of renewable energy sources and energy conservation—sending a message that we need not worry about high gas prices and dependence on imported oil.

Their bill would cut $2 billion from clean water programs, putting public health at risk, and cut $250 million from Great Lakes restoration efforts, putting at greater risk our unique Great Lakes, on which hundreds of thousands of jobs depend.

The Republican bill would cut more than $1 billion from Head Start. Their message seems to be that 200,000 American children don't really need an early childhood education boost so they can grow up to compete in a global economy. Their bill would also cut or eliminate Pell grants for hundreds of thousands of college students. The Republican message: American families don't need help to meet the rising cost of college.

Speaker BOEHNER's Web site proclaims that ''[s]ecuring our borders and stopping the flood of illegal immigration into the United States must be the first priority of this Congress.'' So what does the House bill do? It cuts more than $120 million from the President's request and more than $350 million from the fiscal 2010 level from border security efforts.

Now, the supporters of the House bill tell us that they regret the need for these cuts, that these would be worthy programs in happier times, but that the fiscal straits in which we find ourselves make their cuts necessary. They say we have no choice.

That is false. We do have a choice. We can end the excessive tax cuts for

upper income taxpayers that President Bush put in place, and close tax loopholes that not only drain the treasury but send American jobs abroad to boot.

The cost to the government of those upper income tax cuts is an increase in the deficit of about $30 billion a year. Ending that $30 billion tax cut for the wealthy—for the roughly 2 percent of Americans at the very top—could allow us to avoid the drastic cuts in important programs that I have mentioned, and much more besides.

It is very difficult in my book to treat proposals adding $30 billion a year to the deficit by protecting tax cuts for upper income earners as serious deficit reduction.

There are also other revenues we can look to if we are truly serious about deficit reduction. There are a number of tax loopholes that we can close. For example, we should not continue to give corporations a tax deduction when they send American jobs overseas. We should not allow corporations and wealthy individuals to avoid U.S. taxes by hiding assets and income in offshore tax havens. And we should not allow hedge fund managers to earn enormous incomes and yet pay a lower tax rate than their secretaries and janitors pay.

When we are willing to tackle those issues, when we recognize that the solution to our deficits must be comprehensive, when we acknowledge that it must include revenues, when we acknowledge the need to close those tax loopholes, then the American people will know we are serious about deficit reduction. Then, and only then, will we be able to tackle the deficit without threatening the education of our children, or making it harder to afford college, or cutting food programs for children, or damaging our support for science and technology, or making our border less secure, or reducing efforts to find new sources of energy, or setting back so many other investments in our future well-being.

I commend Senator INOUYE for his attempts to craft an alternative package that would avoid the draconian cuts that Republicans have proposed. But I cannot support that legislation. It deals only with cuts in nondefense discretionary spending, and as a result it gives support to a pattern of debating only spending cuts as the solution to our deficits, when it fact the solution to this problem must include additional revenue as well.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to share my perspectives about the funding for agencies and programs under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government. It has been my privilege to chair this subcommittee for over 4 years.

Overall, the Senate CR includes $23.25 billion for financial services accounts. This represents a cut of $2.268 billion, or 9 percent, below the President's fiscal year 2011 budget request of $25.518 billion.

Compared to the fiscal year 2010 enacted level of $24.355 billion—the amount presently available under the continuing resolution—the funding in the Senate CR is a reduction of over $1.1 billion. This is a cut of over 4 percent below a freeze.

In comparison, the House funding of $20.513 billion for financial services is a cut of $3.84 billion, or 16 percent, below a freeze. This is extreme. It is harmful. It is unacceptable.

The Senate approach, while making significant and difficult cuts, restores $2.737 billion of irresponsible cuts made in H.R. 1. The Senate CR preserves reasonable funding to minimize erosions in critical government programs and prevent harmful setbacks in the delivery of important public services.

Let me take this opportunity to illustrate some of the harsh, detrimental reductions included in H.R. 1, and why the funding recommended in the Senate CR offers a prudent alternative.

For the Treasury's Community Development Financial Institutions Fund, or CDFI, the Senate CR provides $247 million, a freeze to the fiscal year 2010 level. CDFI funds provide seed financing in our nation's most challenged communities for projects such as affordable housing developments, retail developments, small business lending, and community facilities such as day care centers and charter schools.

Each dollar of Federal spending provides confidence for private investors. For example, last year, the Community Investment Corporation, a CDFI in Illinois, leveraged a $1 million Federal grant into $400 million of total financing from 33 banks for affordable housing. CDFI funds offer a lifeline for small businesses and communities that would otherwise have no option to find financing during these tough economic times. CDFI funds are truly the ''last mile'' of financing in struggling communities.

By contrast, H.R. 1 reduces funding for the CDFI Fund to a mere $50 million, a drastic 80-percent reduction below the Senate CR level. If enacted, H.R. 1's cuts to the CDFI Fund would result in the loss of an estimated $1.6 billion in private sector leveraging for investment in America's most challenged communities.

This huge reduction in financing would cause the loss of 19,200 new jobs that would otherwise be created, the loss of 14,100 affordable housing units that would otherwise be built, and the loss of 3,200 small business loans that would otherwise be made. It would be a mistake to enact H.R. 1's cuts to CDFI. The Senate CR level is a responsible way to maintain investment in our Nation's most challenged communities during these tough economic times.

For the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, $286 million is provided in the Senate CR. On the other hand, H.R. 1 decimates the resources for this agency by slashing funding down to a meager $112 million. This is a cut of $57 million, or 33 percent, below a freeze at the current level of $168.8 million. The Senate level supports necessary staffing increases and key information technology investments to help the CFTC better protect the average investor and increase safeguards against excessive speculation.

The House level would prevent the CFTC from meeting its mission to monitor the markets. It would jeopardize CFTC's work to ensure that the ever evolving world of commodity futures—diversified products from grains to gold, from currencies to carbon credits—are free from manipulation, fraud, and abusive trading and sales practices. Futures prices—and CFTC's oversight role—impact what we pay for the basic necessities of everyday life: our food, our clothing, fuel in our vehicles, and heat in our homes. The House sledgehammer cut to the CFTC is irresponsible and irrational.

For the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Senate CR provides $1.3 billion, consistent with the authorized level for fiscal year 2011. These funds support increased legal and investigative staffing for oversight and enforcement responsibilities as well as substantial investments in IT upgrades. By contrast, H.R. 1 cuts resources for the SEC to $1.069 billion. This is a reduction of $41 million, or 4 percent, below a freeze. It is a decrease of $231 million, or 18 percent, below the authorized level.

Among a long list of expected setbacks, the decreased funding in H.R. 1 will severely limit SEC's ability to police the markets and enforce Federal securities laws to protect investors from deceptive financial schemes. It will limit SEC's pursuit of quality complaints, tips, and referrals and will stall investigations.

Less funding will diminish the SEC's ability to conduct public company oversight, review public filings of large financial institutions, and decrease the frequency of reviews of smaller and mid-sized companies to less than once every 3 years. Is this really what we want in the wake of the Wall Street fiasco?

H.R. 1 cuts mean that outmoded technology will languish without critical modernization, leaving the SEC to lag far behind the industries it regulates. SEC will be hampered in its ability to collect the tremendous amounts of market data needed to better identify, address, and prevent activities and events that can disrupt markets and harm investors, such as those that occurred on May 6, 2010—the ''flash crash''. Why supporters of H.R. 1 want to undercut this watchdog agency is hard to comprehend.

For the Small Business Administration, the Senate CR provides $762 million, in essence a freeze at the fiscal year 2010 level due to available carryover balances. In contrast, H.R. 1 reduces SBA's operating budget by $25 million compared to the Senate CR. This cut would reduce staff across the entire SBA. Reducing staff would cause a backlog in loan approvals under SBA's loan programs that support over

$20 billion a year in financing for new and expanding small businesses. A loan approval backlog would impose delays and uncertainty in financing for small businesses during a critical time in the Nation's economic recovery.

The cut to SBA would also scale back the ability of SBA's field staff to serve small businesses seeking credit and business counseling resources. This will deprive small businesses of critical ''matchmaking'' connections to banks participating in SBA's loan programs and to counseling programs for starting and growing small businesses. The Senate CR funding for SBA is a responsible alternative to H.R. 1's reckless cut. The Senate CR will keep SBA operational to support American small businesses working towards economic recovery.

For tax law enforcement, the Senate CR provides $5.59 billion to the Internal Revenue Service. It is a modest but rational increase of $87 million, or 1.6 percent, above the fiscal year 2010 enacted level of $5.5 billion. The funding includes critical resources for targeting offshore tax evasion.

In contrast, H.R. 1 cuts tax law enforcement to $5.219 billion, which is $285 million, or 5 percent, below a freeze. Cutting IRS resources is counterintuitive to the goal of reducing the Federal deficit. Under H.R. 1, lost enforcement revenue could surpass well over $4 billion. Reductions under H.R. 1 would necessitate furloughing all enforcement employees for up to 19 business days and/or significant RIFs.

Among other consequences, the H.R. 1 cut means 164,000 fewer individual and business audits, directly affecting the performance of IRS's enforcement revenue efforts and reducing overall compliance. It will mean 8,400 fewer taxpayer appeals case closures, as fewer taxpayers are able to turn to the appeals process to resolve disputed tax controversies.

Moreover, 310 fewer criminal cases will be completed, 216 fewer convictions will be realized, and an estimated $67 million in asset forfeiture revenue will be sacrificed. It also means the discontinuance of fraud cases related to the Return Preparer Program, drug trafficking tax cases, and interagency efforts in coordination with the Justice Department and Drug Enforcement Administration.

For the General Services Administration, the Senate CR would provide $591 million for construction of Federal buildings, providing continuation funding for multiyear, consolidation projects and nearly $398 million for repair of Federal buildings and courthouses. In contrast, H.R. 1 eliminates all funding for Federal building construction and all major repairs for Federal buildings. Overall, the Senate CR reduces GSA programs below fiscal year 2010 levels and by a total of approximately $1 billion below fiscal year 2011 requested levels.

The House approach is irresponsible because it defers Federal construction projects, making them more expensive; results in more Federal leasing, which is more expensive over the long-term than federally owned space; and prevents Federal agencies from operating as efficiently as possible due to delays in moving into new space necessary to meet mission requirements.

In addition, eliminating the construction and repair projects could cost as many as 16,000 private sector jobs in the construction and related industries. It would also delay other benefits associated with Federal capital projects, including economic development and ''multiplier effects'' of infusions of Federal spending into local economies.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, it is likely that neither the House nor Senate version of the fiscal year 2011 continuing resolution will pass this body.

I would like to highlight one feature of both of the bills we are considering that I believe is truly misguided. Neither bill provides funding to continue the alternate engine program for the F–35 airplane.

In the past, Congress has supported this engine in a bipartisan, bicameral way as a lower cost, higher performance alternate that will save billions in tax dollars and give the F35 engine program competition it badly needs.

There has been significant misinformation circulated about the alternate engine program, which, based on previous experience with engine competition programs, should actually reduce the Federal deficit by more than $20 billion.

During the 1980s, the Air Force and Navy jointly qualified second sources for the Sidewinder, Sparrow, Amraam, Maverick, Standard, Tomahawk, and Ham missile programs. In every case, buying from both sources brought costs down dramatically. That same strategy brought costs down and under budget for the FFG–7 frigates, DDG–51 destroyers, Aegis Cruisers, and attack submarines.

Absent the F35 alternative engine program, a company that is currently $3.5 billion over budget will be the monopoly provider of the engine for the F35 airplane. This is not the way taxpayers want Washington to do business.

The alternate engine program supports 2,500 jobs in the United States, 800 of those in Ohio. My State's unemployment rates is already 9.3 percent, and it would be a tragedy if we eliminate jobs that are actually serving to reduce federal spending and protect against faulty or delayed access to engines needed by our military.

I am disappointed no funds are contained in either bill. I don't believe you walk quietly away from a $100 billion program that has billions of tax dollars invested in it without a vigorous debate. In deleting the alternate engine, both bills eliminated a line item today at the expense of significant savings downstream.

We are not going to end the budget deficit by haphazardly taking dollars out of investments justified not only by their public policy purpose—in this case, equipping our military in the most responsible, efficient means possible—but by their potential to produce major downstream savings.

It is unclear how the negotiations on getting a budget deal will proceed and it is equally clear that they will be hard. But the future of this engine must be on the agenda.

Our safety and security as a nation and the seriousness of the budget choices that face us are simply too important to let expediency get the better of common sense. Exploring what is best for our military and our budget goals must be part of the continuing resolution negotiations.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, over the past few weeks, I have listened to several of my colleagues say that the Defense budget should be further reduced. Other Members are concerned that this bill cuts too much funding out of the Department of Defense.

I believe the Defense bill before you today strikes a fair balance between responsible reductions and protection of our military forces.

The defense portion of this bill provides a total of $671.5 billion in base and overseas contingency operation funding for fiscal year 2011.

The base budget is $513.6 billion, which is $17.3 billion less than the President's budget request. This bill cuts an additional $2.13 billion more than H.R. 1 for defense. I believe that these reductions are prudent, and reflect the reality of today's challenging fiscal environment where all programs are subject to reductions.

But let me be clear—this bill continues to fully support our men and women in uniform and protects funding for four important national security priorities.

First, the bill takes care of our military personnel. It fully funds the 1.4 percent authorized pay raise and provides $887 million above the budget request to cover shortfalls in the military personnel accounts that were identified by the services.

Second, the bill fully funds health care for the military and their families. The bill provides $32.8 billion for the Defense Health Program, continues advancements in medical research, modernizes and maintains medical infrastructure, and develops the next generation of electronic medical records.

In addition, the bill adds $100 million for peer-reviewed research in psychological health and traumatic brain injury.

Third, the bill fully funds key readiness programs critical to prepare forces for combat operations and other peace time missions, including flying hours and steaming days, depot maintenance, training, spare parts, and base operations.

Additional funding is included to provide for shortfalls identified by the

Army for base operations, for the Navy and Air Force for depot maintenance, and tuition assistance for military spouses.

Fourth, the bill provides additional funding to protect our forces, including new equipment and upgrades to existing programs to ensure that our military has the hardware needed to conduct operations and train during a time of war. High-priority programs are increased, such as:

The replacement of helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft lost in battle, and increased production of Army and Air Force helicopters urgently needed to support combat operations in Afghanistan;

Support for critical intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, ISR, initiatives, including procurement of 48 Reaper unmanned aerial vehicles and more than $2.5 billion of ISR programs identified by the Secretary of Defense as high priority for troops overseas;

Better protection of deployed military personnel, such as $3.4 billion to fully fund Mine Resistant Ambush Protected-All Terrain Vehicles and an additional $225 million to test and procure the Stryker Double V Hull for additional protection from IEDs;

An additional $850 million for the National Guard and Reserve to ensure that our Reserve components have the equipment needed to conduct their growing missions.

Furthermore, the bill continues our goal to transfer responsibility to our partners in Afghanistan and Iraq so that our forces can safely and responsibly withdrawal.

The bill provides $11.6 billion for the Afghanistan security forces fund, $1.5 billion for the Iraq security forces fund, $500 million for the Commander's emergency response program, and $400 million for the Afghanistan infrastructure fund.

However, the Department of Defense is not immune from budget reductions. I believe this bill judiciously cuts defense spending, while improving fiscal accountability. Nearly 760 defense programs are reduced in the package before you today.

These funding cuts are made as a result of program terminations or delays, changes to policy or programs since submission of the budget over a year ago, inadequate justification, authorization adjustments, or corrections to poor fiscal discipline.

For instance, the bill cuts nearly $2 billion out of the Joint Strike Fighter program due to production and testing delays. Over $450 million is deleted from the bill due to the termination of the non-line of sight launch system.

The bill rescinds $1.2 billion from prior year funding in 45 different programs due to poor execution, delays or terminations. The list goes on and on.

This is a fair bill for the Department of Defense. It is a bipartisan compromise between responsibly reducing defense spending while at the same time providing for our men and women in uniform that are fighting a war in Afghanistan, winding down operations in Iraq, and operating around the globe to protect this Nation's security.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority's time has expired.

The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I want us to remember why we are here. The reason we are here right now debating this issue is because last year the Democratic majority failed to pass a budget. They did not pass a budget and did not pass a single appropriations bill. This is a $3.7 trillion enterprise called the Federal Government. Last year, we did not pass a budget. We did not pass a single appropriations bill. So this is cleaning up the unfinished business of last year.

It was always said that we could not do this before the election. So when the election was over with, instead of dealing with these important budget issues, we did a START treaty, which, of course, was important to debate; don't ask, don't tell; the DREAM Act; all kinds of other things but never the budget. We did not deal with the budget. So here we are dealing with last year's unfinished business.

So when my colleagues come in here and make all these arguments about how terrible it is that we are having to do this and the House Republicans have sent us this budget that shaves $60 billion from last year's spending levels, the reason we are having to go through this exercise in the first place is because last year the Democratic majority did not even pass a budget.

Where does that leave us today? Well, we all know we have a $14 trillion debt—$14 trillion. I think that has sunk in with the American people. To put that into perspective, historically, this last month—the month of February—our debt was $223 billion. Our deficit, in other words—what we added to the debt—was $223 billion in 1 month—the largest single monthly total ever. We added more to the debt last month than we did from the founding of our country until 1945—in just 1 month.

The projected deficit for this entire year is $1.65 trillion—the largest ever in nominal terms. And OMB predicts it to be the largest as a share of our economy since World War II. That is as much debt as we ran up from the founding of our country until 1985. This is the dimension of the problem we are dealing with.

There is an old saying that if you are in a hole, stop digging. Well, we continue to dig the hole deeper and deeper and deeper. So we are going to have votes today on a couple of alternatives.

One is the alternative that was sent over from the House of Representatives which shaves $60 billion off of last year's spending level. So there are lots of people coming down here, and there is all kinds of gnashing of teeth and statements of how Draconian these various cuts are going to be. Mr. President, $60 billion, remember, in a $3.7 trillion budget is less than 2 percent. Now, to the average American, if they were like we are at the Federal level and out of every dollar they spent, they were borrowing over 40 cents and running $1.5 trillion and $1.6 trillion deficits year over year over year, I think they would figure out a way to tighten their belts a little bit and be able to absorb a 1.5-percent cut over last year's spending level.

Now, couple that with the fact that since 2008 spending has increased by 22 percent. Nondefense discretionary spending, which is what we are talking about here, has gone up 22 percent—10 times the rate of inflation. All we are talking about here is going back to 2008 levels. This is not Draconian. I think the American people think this is reasonable.

So what does the other side put forward? The other side said: Well, we think this is Draconian, and so we are going to put forward a proposal that cuts $4.7 billion—$4.7 billion compared to $60 billion. Mr. President, $4.7 billion is what the other side puts on the table in terms of spending reduction in trying to do something about our runaway Federal debt. Well, if you look at the clock today, it is 2:45 p.m. By this time tomorrow—2:45 p.m. tomorrow—we will have added over $4 billion to the debt—almost as much as they are proposing to save for the balance of this entire year. So they are laying forward savings of $4.7 billion for the rest of the fiscal year, when between now and this time tomorrow we will add over $4 billion to the Federal debt. That is the dimension of what we are talking about.

It is so bad that former Fed Chairman Alan Greenspan said recently that he views the probability or the possibility of a debt crisis occurring in the next 2 to 3 years to be 50 percent—debt crisis. If that is not enough, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the highest ranking military official in this country, ADM Mike Mullen, said a few months back that the greatest threat to America's national security is our national debt. How much more do we have to hear? It is not just a threat to our future and to future generations; it is a threat to our national security, and it is a threat to our economy.

We have all kinds of evidence out there that this level of spending and this amount of debt costs jobs in our economy. Everybody says the most important thing we want to focus on is the economy and job creation. I agree with that. One of the best ways to do that is to start getting spending and debt under control. There is a great variety of research out there that studied the last eight centuries of governments and concluded that when your gross debt reaches the 90-percent level of your total economy—in other words, gross debt to GDP equals 90 percent—that it costs you about 1 percentage point of economic growth every year. According to Christina Romer, the

former economic adviser to the President, every time you lose 1 percentage point of economic growth, you lose 1 million jobs. So if we continue to sustain this level of debt, it is costing us economic growth, which is costing us literally jobs every single day.

A couple of weeks ago the Government Accountability Office issued a report and in it they looked at the government and the various agencies of government and how much it costs and looked for duplication and redundancy and inefficiency. What did they conclude? They concluded that there are 82 programs in this country across 10 different agencies and departments of government that are designed to improve teacher quality; granted, a very noble goal, but does it take 82 Federal programs and 10 agencies or departments to administer programs improving teacher quality? There are 56 Federal programs out there which teach people how to manage their finances. When you are running a $14 trillion debt, arguably this is probably the last place that ought to be advising people about managing their finances. But 56 Federal programs? The American people have to be looking at this, and it is incomprehensible to them, I think, to see what their Federal Government wastes money on.

What we are talking about here is a fairly reasonable reduction in nondefense, nonnational security discretionary spending. I hope today we will take a step forward and demonstrate we are serious. What the Democrats put forward, $4.7 billion, isn't serious. It completely ignores and appears to be in denial of the dimensions of this problem, which I think are wholly grasped by the American people. In fact, we had testimony yesterday in front of the Senate Budget Committee from Erskine Bowles and Senator Al Simpson who headed the debt commission and said this is the most predictable crisis we have ever had. We see it coming. We know it is coming. We can do something about it, and we are trying to today.

It is about jobs. People have gotten up on the other side and said, Well, it is going to cut this or cut that. The majority leader said yesterday we can't do this because it would cut funding at the Cowboy Poetry Festival. When you are out of every dollar you are spending, borrowing more than 40 cents; when you are running a $14 trillion debt—there are priorities, arguably, that are important in terms of Federal priorities. I don't think that probably counts as one of them and I don't think the American people would think so either.

The Senator from Montana said this is going to cut people from Medicare Advantage. What about the health care reform bill last year? That cut $2 billion in Medicare Advantage and would leave literally a quarter of those people who get benefits under Medicare Advantage without that coverage today. That wasn't a big talking point for the other side when we were doing health care reform last year. Yet, today, again, we hear typical rhetorical scare tactics. But what I want to remind my colleagues of and remind the American people of is that over the last 2 years, nondefense discretionary spending has increased 22 percent.

All we are talking about is going back to 2008 levels. Since that time, it has increased 10 times the rate of inflation. We need to start living within our means. We cannot continue to spend money we don't have.

I hope my colleagues will support H.R. 1 and let the American people know we are serious about getting our fiscal house in order.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 11 minutes 25 seconds remaining.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the Chair let me know when 2 minutes remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be so notified.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his eloquent remarks. He phrased exactly the question before this body on which we are going to be casting two votes within a few minutes, and that is this: Will we or will we not stop spending money we don't have? I repeat, the question is: Will we or will we not stop spending money we don't have? Do we have the courage and the common sense and the sense of responsibility to make difficult decisions for the future of our country when it comes to spending and debt?

Let's look at the facts. The Federal Government this year is collecting $2.2 trillion—that is what is coming in—and spending $3.7 trillion. We are collecting $2.2 trillion in revenue, and we are spending $3.7 trillion in revenue. That is a fact.

Here is another fact: Forty cents of every dollar the Federal Government spends is borrowed, much of it from China.

Here is another fact: We are piling up new debt at the rate of $4 billion a day—$4 billion a day of new debt. Here is another fact: Last month was the shortest month of the year—February. The deficit—that is this year's deficit in just that month—was the largest in history: $223 billion. And our friends on the other side are suggesting we solve a problem of this dimension by reducing spending by $4.7 billion. As Senator THUNE said, by tomorrow, at about this time, we will have piled up as much more debt as they propose to save. That is not urgent; that is not responsible; that is not dealing with difficult decisions in the way people expect us to do.

The Republicans in the House of Representatives have stepped up and have made difficult decisions. We might not agree with every single detail of the decision, and the Senate will have its own priorities when we pass a bill, but I, for one—and I think many others on this side of the aisle—are going to vote for H.R. 1, the House-passed $57 billion cut, because it is a sure step toward reducing spending and stopping our country from spending money we don't have. Senate Democrats say, Sorry, we can only find $4.7 billion to save.

The purpose of the vote I will cast today is to say we have an urgent need that needs to be addressed. We have a sense of responsibility toward that decision. We can't solve much of it today, but we can solve some of it today, and the time to start addressing this urgent need is now.

When I became Governor of Tennessee about 30 years ago, a friend gave me a book written by George Reedy, Lyndon Johnson's press secretary. It was called ''The Twilight of the Presidency.'' In that book, I found a definition I used as Governor because it was such a good definition of what an executive in public life is to do. George Reedy said that the job of the President is, No. 1, to see an urgent need; No. 2, to develop a strategy to meet the need; and No. 3, to persuade at least half the people that he is right. See an urgent need, develop a strategy to meet the need, and persuade at least half the people he is right.

This is an urgent need facing our country. Forty cents out of every dollar we spend is borrowed; $2.2 trillion coming in; $3.7 trillion going out; 47 top economists over 2 weekends ago saying it was the most urgent need facing our country. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is saying it is our biggest national security threat—the debt. As Senator THUNE said, debt costs jobs. Economists tell us that debt at this level costs us about 1 million jobs a year.

Let me read what the President's own debt commission had to say about this. This debt commission had six Members of the U.S. Senate as members—three Republicans, three Democrats. Five of the six voted for this report of the debt commission. They said, as members of this commission:

> We spent the past 8 months studying the same hard, cold facts—

Not opinions, facts.

> Together we have reached these unavoidable conclusions. The problem is real. The solution will be painful. There is no easy way out. Everything must be on the table, and Washington must lead.

That is President Obama's debt commission. After all the talk about debt and deficits, they go on to say:

> It is long past time for America's leaders to put up or shut up.

That is the President's debt commission talking.

> The era of debt denial is over. There can be no turning back. We sign our names to this plan because we love our children, our grandchildren, and our country too much not to act while we still have the chance to secure a better future for all of our citizens.

That report included five Members of this body, two Democrats, three Republicans. That was what the debt commission had to say.

Here is what the President had to say. In 2009 he said:

What we have done is kicked this can down the road. We are now at the end of the road. We are not in a position to kick it any further.

We can only find $4 billion to save?

President Obama said last year:

I hope some of the folks who are hollering about deficits and debt step up, because I am calling their bluff.

We can only save $4 billion?

My administration is going to seek to work with Congress to execute serious entitlement reform.

And then as Senator the President said:

Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically, weakens us internationally. Leadership means the buck stops here. Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today on to the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership.

I ask, where is the President of the United States in this debate? Where is the President of the United States? His debt commission came out months ago and recommended $4 trillion in savings. No support from the President. The President made an eloquent State of the Union Address. I sat on the front row and applauded many times. No sense of urgency about the Federal debt. The President offered his budget a few weeks ago. No plan for reducing the Federal debt.

Now we are taking step No. 1, which is to work on the discretionary part of the budget—only about 12 percent of the budget. The House is willing to take difficult steps; the Senate Democratic majority says we can only find an amount that equals the debt we are piling up in one 24-hour period; and the President is missing in action.

I respectfully say that is not leadership. We need the President of the United States to join us in an effort to stop our country from spending money we don't have, in making difficult decisions about spending, so we can assure the strength and future of our country.

The question before us is will we or will we not stop spending money we don't have? Will we or will we not make the difficult decisions it takes to reduce spending so that our country will be strong for the future?

The other side says they can find $4.7 billion to save. We say we can start with $57 billion. I will vote for the $57 billion and against the $4.7 billion because that is a sure step toward a bright path for America's future.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the remaining time? There is 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Under the previous order, the question is on the passage of H.R. 1. Under that order, 60 votes are required for passage.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 56, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 36 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Alexander	Ensign	McConnell
Ayotte	Enzi	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Murkowski
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Brown (MA)	Hoeven	Roberts
Burr	Hutchison	Rubio
Chambliss	Inhofe	Sessions
Coats	Isakson	Shelby
Coburn	Johanns	Snowe
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Collins	Kirk	Toomey
Corker	Kyl	Vitter
Cornyn	Lugar	Wicker
Crapo	McCain	

NAYS—56

Akaka	Hagan	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Begich	Inouye	Paul
Bennet	Johnson (SD)	Pryor
Bingaman	Kerry	Reed
Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Reid
Boxer	Kohl	Rockefeller
Brown (OH)	Landrieu	Sanders
Cantwell	Lautenberg	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Lee	Stabenow
Casey	Levin	Tester
Conrad	Lieberman	Udall (CO)
Coons	Manchin	Udall (NM)
DeMint	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Webb
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Mikulski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 44, the nays 56. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for passage of this bill, the bill is rejected.

The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 149

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator INOUYE, I send to the desk amendment No. 149.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mr. INOUYE, proposes an amendment numbered 149.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of Friday, March 4, 2011.)

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 149.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 58, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 37 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baucus	Franken	Murray
Begich	Gillibrand	Pryor
Bingaman	Harkin	Reed
Blumenthal	Inouye	Reid
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Brown (OH)	Kerry	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Landrieu	Stabenow
Carper	Lautenberg	Tester
Casey	Leahy	Udall (NM)
Conrad	Lieberman	Warner
Coons	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Merkley	Wyden

NAYS—58

Alexander	Grassley	Murkowski
Ayotte	Hagan	Nelson (NE)
Barrasso	Hatch	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Hoeven	Paul
Blunt	Hutchison	Portman
Boozman	Inhofe	Risch
Brown (MA)	Isakson	Roberts
Burr	Johanns	Rubio
Chambliss	Johnson (WI)	Sanders
Coats	Kirk	Sessions
Coburn	Kohl	Shelby
Cochran	Kyl	Snowe
Collins	Lee	Thune
Corker	Levin	Toomey
Cornyn	Lugar	Udall (CO)
Crapo	Manchin	Vitter
DeMint	McCain	Webb
Ensign	McCaskill	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	
Graham	Moran	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, there are 42 yeas, 58 nays. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Under the previous order, the measure will be returned to the calendar.

The Senator from Minnesota.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BIG PICTURE

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about H.R. 1, the House bill we just voted down and which I will continue to oppose until major changes are made. With apologies to Nobel Prize-winning economist Paul Krugman, I would like to talk about Willy Sutton for a second. While we should not normally take fiscal lessons from criminals, Willy Sutton had it right. He said he robbed banks because ''that's where the money is.'' Of course, he didn't target places with only petty cash. What is the point of robbing a school or a homeless shelter? There is no money there. But that is exactly what H.R. 1 seeks to do.

Instead of tackling our deficits by going after the bank, it is targeting our most vulnerable. Domestic nonsecurity discretionary spending makes up only 12 percent of our budget. We cannot balance the budget with only 12 percent of the budget on the table. We need to be looking at the big picture. We need to be focusing on the bank, where the money is.

In President Obama's State of the Union Address he said in order to get back on track, to build prosperity, we need to out-educate, out-build, and out-innovate the rest of the world. Ask any small business owner and they will agree that though sometimes they have to trim overhead, they have to also make smart target investments for their business to grow. So why does H.R. 1 do exactly the opposite?

The President calls for education funding that supports afterschool programs from Bemidji to Worthington. Yet H.R. 1 cuts $100 million. In Minnesota, H.R. 1 would effectively eliminate afterschool programs for nearly 2,000 kids. H.R. 1 also cuts job training programs, virtually zeroing out the first title in WIA, even when 3,000 Minnesotans are on waiting lists to get training for jobs that are going unfilled. I talked to businesses all over Minnesota and they need trained workers. They support the Workforce Investment Act.

The President calls for infrastructure. Yet H.R. 1 cuts surface transportation projects across the country, including nearly $8 million for a new railroad crossing in Staples and $250,000 for the St. Paul Complete Streets Plan.

The Department of Transportation estimates that H.R. 1 would effectively cancel 75 projects in 40 States across the country and put more than 30,000 jobs at risk nationwide.

The President calls for innovation. Yet H.R. 1 cuts $2.5 billion in lifesaving biomedical and health research at the National Institutes of Health and National Cancer Institute. The United States and my home State of Minnesota have been the world leaders in innovative biomedical research. Under H.R. 1, the United States will be forced to detour from our path toward breaking biomedical frontiers. I think we can agree we must not be penny-wise and pound-foolish when it comes to investing in our Nation's future.

H.R. 1 does exactly the opposite of what our country should be doing during an economic recovery. H.R. 1 does not target Willy Sutton's bank, it goes after schools and roads and cancer research.

I have a few ideas for targeting the bank where the money is. Let's start with big oil and gas. Over the past decade, the past 10 years, just the five largest oil and gas companies have made $1 trillion in profit—not revenues, profit; $1 trillion in profit. Yet we are giving them tax subsidies that have been in place since as far back as 1916. Eliminating these wasteful subsidies will bring in about $64 billion over 10 years. Let's do that.

Another bank: Waste and fraud in the health care system. Provisions in the health reform law reduce waste. The value index that I and others pushed for in the health care reform bill is going to ensure that we reward value, not volume, in Medicare.

In Texas, for example, Medicare reimbursements are about 50 percent higher per patient than they are in Minnesota. Yet in Minnesota we have better outcomes. Why? Because we deliver higher value health care at a much lower cost. Imagine how many tens of billions or hundreds of billions of dollars we could save if every State delivered health care like Minnesota does, like my State does.

Also, in Medicare the government pays too much for Medicare prescription drugs. Because Medicare represents so many people, it could negotiate prices directly with the drug companies and deliver the same benefits for seniors at a lower cost. The VA already does this. This simple change could save taxpayers up to $24 billion a year or $240 billion over 10 years. This is where the money is. I am not the first to point out there is waste in health care, but we can do something about it. Guess what. H.R. 1 would cut $250 million from health care fraud and abuse control.

Another bank is the Department of Defense. We all agree we cannot skimp on national security, believe me. When our troops are at war, two wars, we can do nothing to skimp on their safety, their security, their readiness, their ability to fight these wars, or on them when they come back from the war. H.R. 1 makes cuts to programs for homeless vets.

We do not want to skimp on national security, but when the military says it doesn't need or want something, we should listen. When it says it doesn't need the F–35 alternate engine, the Marine Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle, or the Non-Line of Site Launch System, we should not buy them. This could save billions of dollars.

Then, of course, there is revenue. H.R. 1 does nothing to shore up revenue at a time when we still have our troops overseas engaged in combat. We have always paid for our wars before. This time we passed huge tax cuts for the wealthy, and just a couple of months ago my colleagues on the other side of the aisle insisted on extending these tax breaks on income over $1 million. We had a vote on this. It was not enough to extend the tax breaks on the first million or the second million or the third million or the tenth million or the twentieth million or the fiftieth million or the hundredth million. Ending the tax breaks for millionaires could have brought in around $35 to $40 billion every year. On the back of the envelope, that is $350 to $400 billion over 10 years—I added a zero.

The President has stated this was only a temporary extension, and I plan to hold him to that. If we are going to be talking about making shared sacrifices and cutting homeless vets and cutting Head Start, let's make sure those shared sacrifices are really shared.

All these ideas need to be on the table, not just 12 percent of our entire budget. If we are at all serious about reforming our budget, and I am talking about serious about this, it has to include the bank. We have to go where the money is.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon, there was a vote on a 2-week continuing resolution to fund the government, and it was divided along party lines. I voted for passage of H.R. 1, the House-passed continuing resolution, which will fund the Federal Government for the remainder of the fiscal year. I supported this measure because I believe it is a critical first step toward reining in our deficit and debt and putting us back on a path to fiscal solvency.

I appreciate the hard work of my colleagues in the House. Their efforts required a lot of compromise and tough decisions. I supported passage of H.R. 1, but I have serious concerns with the defense-related spending of this bill.

The defense-related spending on H.R. 1 is not sufficient for us to carry out our responsibilities to the men and women who are serving in the military and fulfill our national security requirements. Therefore, if we are going to embark on another 2-week continuing resolution, as it appears that reports indicate may be the case, then I will be compelled to propose an amendment that will then fund our Nation's national security requirements for the remainder of the year. That number, as I have determined it, is approximately $535 billion for normal defense appropriations, and $159 billion for war funding, known as overseas contingency operations.

The Secretary of Defense, with whom I have disagreed from time to time—which I think is natural and appropriate—I believe is perhaps the finest Secretary of Defense who has ever served this Nation in many respects. I am sure there are others who were outstanding. But in recent memory, I have not met a person who has led our Defense Department with the qualities of leadership and dedication as Secretary Gates. I pay close attention—and I hope all of us do—particularly to the fact that we have Americans in harm's way in two wars and the turmoil that now is present in the Middle East, in the Arab world, in the Maghreb.

The Secretary of Defense has said unequivocally that he cannot guarantee

we are defending this Nation's vital national security interests if we continue on a 2-week by 2-week by 2-week sequence. There is not the kind of funding nor the kind of assurance to the men and women serving that we can adequately train and equip and make them fight at their highest efficiencies and capabilities. I disagree—and I will list some of the areas where I disagree—with the funding requirements. I don't agree with the number the Secretary of Defense has said, which is $540 billion. I think we can do it with $535 billion.

The fact is we can't subject our Nation's national security to a 2-week by 2-week process. It is not the way the Defense Department can function and this Nation can defend itself and its vital national security interests. We owe it to the men and women serving in harm's way as we speak.

The aspects of the Defense Appropriations bill that need to be taken away, eliminated, are $300 million for medical research. I am sure the medical research is important, but it has nothing to do with national defense. Within that $300 million is $15 million for peer-reviewed Alzheimer's research, $150 million for peer-reviewed breast cancer research, $12.8 million for peer-reviewed lung cancer research, $20 million for peer-reviewed ovarian cancer research, $80 million for peer-reviewed prostate cancer research, and $4.8 million for multiple sclerosis—all of which are worthy causes, but none have anything to do with defending this country. If they want them to be funded—and they deserve to be in many respects—they should come out of the Health and Human Services Appropriations, not out of Defense.

What has happened around here over the years is what I'll call the ''Willie Sutton syndrome.'' He was the famous bank robber. They once asked him why he robbed banks. He said: That is where the money is. So some special interests have wanted funding for various projects that are either good or bad, or programs that are either good or bad, which have nothing to do with defense. We cannot afford those anymore. If we want to fund a program, it should come out of the appropriate area of responsibility of the Appropriations Committee.

Both bills include about $70 million for private organizations and charities, such as $24 million for the Red Cross, $1.2 million for the Special Olympics, $20 million for youth mentoring grants—all worthy causes and all not defense related.

Both bills direct $550 million for nondefense public infrastructure projects, such as $250 million for improvements to local schools that are not part of the Department of Defense school system. If they need to be funded, take it out of the proper appropriations moneys. It also includes $300 million for roads.

Equally troubling is the way the bills make objectionable changes to the overseas contingency operations funding—the OCO. The overseas contingency operation funds are specifically for Iraq and Afghanistan. Both of the bills cut the Iraq security force funding by $500 million. They also shift funding for nine F–18 Hornets from base to the overseas contingency operations, despite the fact that we have not lost an F–18, and that is $500 million. It shifts $500 million in funding for UAVs from the base, where they were properly requested, to OCO. They should not be designated to overseas contingency operations. They fund 20 additional missile defense interceptors for $190 million, and they include more than $37 million in funding support for the southwest border for the National Guard. I strongly support funding for the southwest border—to have it secured—and I will continue to advocate for that, but it doesn't apply to overseas contingency operations.

As we proceed, I intend to work to remove the nondefense-related spending from these bills, restore that funding to DOD priorities, including full funding for our troops in combat and the costs needed to maintain and restore their equipment.

I don't know if the government will be shut down. I don't know where there will be compromise. I don't know if we will engage in entitlement reform and all of the different scenarios that we could draw as to what is going to happen here at high noon in the great drama of our Nation's Capitol. We cannot forget that we are in 2 wars; that we have 100,000 troops in Afghanistan and approximately 50,000 in Iraq—those are rough numbers—not to mention other civilians and members of the diplomatic corps and other parts of the U.S. Government.

We cannot force them to live 2 weeks by 2 weeks by 2 weeks and not be sufficiently funded. I will be glad to engage with my colleagues in vigorous debate. Maybe they are able to find more ways to save money from our defense spending—and I am sure they are there, and I look forward to working with them. But as the Secretary of Defense has tried to make it as clear as possible to the Members of Congress—and I wish the President would weigh in more heavily—we cannot continue functioning and preserve our national security this way.

That is why if we do another 2-week continuing resolution, I will be coming to the floor to propose an amendment to provide funding for our Nation's defense for the remainder of the year.

I take a backseat to no one in my zeal to cut unnecessary spending. I am aware we have mortgaged our children's futures. I know we cannot stop spending the way we are. But the first priority of government—the first priority—is to ensure the safety and security of its citizens. That is why we must appropriately fund our Department of Defense and all its associated functions and especially provide the equipment and training and protection, as much as we can, to the men and women who are serving and sacrificing so the rest of us can live freely.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REDUCTION IN THE DEBT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we had votes this afternoon on the continuing resolution proposal from the House, and the Senate did not approve that. We did not have the 60 votes necessary to accept that. The Democratic proposal, which I would suggest does nothing about the debt, failed. I guess there were four or five party defections. If we take what direction those defections meant, all of those defections went to the more conservative side in that several thought the House reductions in spending were not enough, and several Democratic colleagues thought the Democratic majority leader's proposal did not go far enough.

I would just say that what we need to do—and it is very important that we achieve it—is to move toward a gradual, credible, sustained, mature reduction of the deficits this country has faced, and that takes some tough decisionmaking. It doesn't require us to act in an extreme or drastic way, but it means sustained serious changes in the trajectory in which we are headed.

I would just note that the House proposed reducing our nondefense discretionary spending $61 billion over the rest of the fiscal year. If we take only the discretionary account, that amounts to about a 6-percent reduction. If we take the entire Federal spending, it is less than a 2-percent reduction in the entire Federal spending. So it is utterly implausible that this reduction in spending is so significant that it will impact adversely our economy today—that is one of the arguments they are throwing out—particularly in light of the fact these don't consider that we are dealing with outlays of money that would not even be spent in this fiscal year. It will be spent in the next year or two as we build a project—a road or something—that takes several years to complete. So the actual reduction in outlay in this year would not be that significant, and it will not reduce the fragile growth rate we are in.

What it does, though, is save $61 billion out of this year's appropriations. Over a period of 10 years, that will result in approximately $860 billion in savings because it reduces the baseline by this amount, and it carries out each with the 10 years of the $61 billion reduction, plus the interest saved on all this debt since all of this money is borrowed. We are so deeply in debt, any reduction reduces our debt, it reduces

our interest payment, and it puts us on a sound path.

I do not believe the House sent us anything that is reckless or dangerous or extreme. The majority leader yesterday said it was reckless and used those kind of pejorative terms. It is not. It is a reasonable step that has a significant impact, pushing $1 trillion, actually, over 10. Do a few more little things and we would save $1 trillion on our debt over 10 years, and that is significant.

I would point out, Mr. President, we have had substantial increases in our budgets in the last 2 years—in 2010, in 2011—over the 2008 budget proposal. We have added 25 percent increases in spending in these discretionary programs. Some of them have received substantially more than that. So taking down these numbers will not put us into the poorhouse. It is not going to substantially alter the nature of the very Republic that we are here to serve or the government that is supposed to serve the people. It is not going to savage our government. It is not going to savage the programs.

For example, these reductions on which we voted, if they became law, $61 billion over the rest of this fiscal year would bring us still above the 2008 levels by 4.3 percent. In 2008 we were spending $378 billion on these programs. If this reduction were to be accomplished, the spending for the rest of this year would be $394 billion. That is more than we were spending in 2008, and I believe it is a reasonable reduction.

I suppose, after this vote, that leaders and wise heads and people I affectionately call ''masters of the universe'' will all get together and they will start deciding what we are going to do: You didn't win your vote and we didn't win our vote, so let's just sit down here and let's divide up the pie and you give a little bit more, and we don't want to cut too much spending, you know, and we will just not agree to anything like these spending levels.

I think that would be a mistake. I believe the American people in this last election were very clear that they expected us to do something about this reckless Washington spending. It was dominant in the election. There was a shellacking in this election of the big government big spenders. They went down all over the country—what was it, 87 new House Members elected, the biggest surge in years, every one of them, virtually, promising to contain the reckless spending in Washington.

I cannot understand what it is that people do not comprehend about the nature of the circumstances we are in. Forty cents of every dollar we spend today has been borrowed. Every economist who testified has said we are on an unsustainable path.

Mr. Erskine Bowles testified, President Clinton's former Chief of Staff, a successful businessman himself, the head of the debt commission, along with Alan Simpson, a former Senator. He said we could have a debt crisis in 2 years—maybe a little less, maybe a little more—at the rate we are going. Their joint statement said this country has never been in a situation in which we have such a predictable crisis. Senator Simpson declared that he thought we could have a debt crisis in less than a year. He said: I think it is less than a year, not 2 years. Alan Greenspan in January told the Wall Street Journal that there was a little better—not much—than a 50–50 chance that we would have a debt crisis in 2 to 3 years. These are ominous warnings. You can't spend $3.8 trillion and bring in $2.2 trillion and think you can continue that. It is the largest deficit in the history of the American Republic.

The President's budget that he just submitted to us projects no budget in 10 years less than $600 billion. The last 3 years of his 10-year budget, those deficits are going up to $900 billion. It is the wrong trend. This is not a course we can sustain. We have to get off of it. We could be reaching the precipice sooner than we think—1 year, 2 years, 3 years—if we do not get off this path. We need to take action now.

There is one opportunity; that is, this continuing resolution which allows us to make some reductions—enough to send a message that there are sufficient votes in this Congress to reverse the path we are on. Are there sufficient votes? I believe there are. Partisanship was in these last two votes. We know that. People were pressured on both sides. But the people who did not follow party lines were moving on to the right side, the more conservative, restrained side of spending. I think that suggests there is some momentum out there to do something other than just split the baby on this, how much we are going to reduce spending.

The proposal of the majority leader is really a $4.6 billion reduction. That is less than one-half of 1 percent of the discretionary budget and a mere fraction of the total Federal spending this year. That is nothing.

The choice is, are we going to do nothing or are we going to do something? Are we going to listen to the warnings that we are facing a predictable crisis financially or not? We can do this. This is not going to be a dramatic reduction in spending. Frankly, I would like to see it go a good bit lower, as a number of people in the Senate I know believe. But most of us believed it was significant, it puts us on a downward path, and it saves $61 billion this year and $850 billion over 10. That is a pretty good amount to save in 7 months of this fiscal year, and we will come back next year and we will do more and better work.

We are going to have to bring entitlements into the discussion, but the President is going to have to step up on that. If he is going to oppose that, nothing is going to pass on entitlements, that is for sure. So we need some leadership, and we can move this in the right direction.

I am disappointed there were not more votes for the House proposal, but at least on the Republican side it got every Republican vote except a few who believed it did not go far enough in reducing spending.

I believe the message needs to be, to whoever is meeting in these secret chambers without the American people and without—I won't be in there, I am sure. They will be meeting and making these plots. They need to know we are not just looking for any token cuts. We need to do something that is significant. We need to stay with the House number. That is what we need to do. It would be so good for this country. The whole world would say: This new Congress, they are taking a noticeable step. They actually reduced spending. Maybe in the United States they are ready to get their house in order. Maybe we do not mind continuing to buy their bonds. Maybe they will be able to honor their debts without debasing their currency. Maybe it is a good investment.

I believe that is what we need to be saying because otherwise we could be in a situation in which our debt surges, the interest on our debt surges, and the value of our currency is debased, and that will put us on the road to political as well as economic decline.

As ranking Republican on the Budget Committee, we have been wrestling with these issues. I thank Senator CONRAD, our chairman. He has had some good hearings and good witnesses and good testimony, but it is time for action, not just talk. We need to do something.

This is the bill that is before us. This CR is a vehicle by which we can speak to the American people, speak to the financial markets, say to the entire world that the United States realizes that our path is an unsustainable one, and we are going to do something about it. We are moving off that path. We are going to take the hard road. It will be a tougher road for a while, but it is the road to prosperity, it is the road to growth, and it is the road to more jobs.

Excessive debt slows down the economy, as Reinhart and Rogoff's book and testimony show, as Secretary Geithner testified before the committee. It has already slowed our growth, he has acknowledged, and he is afraid we could have a debt crisis on an adverse incident that is exacerbated by the very high levels of debt we are under.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOB LOSSES

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I do not intend to speak long. I know we are getting ready to wrap up. I will not interfere with that. But I did not want the day to end without a reminder of the concern that H.R. 1 and the significant, serious cuts it imposes will produce significant, serious job losses. That is not something being manufactured on our side of the aisle. It comes from careful analysis from very neutral forums.

Many people will have seen this graphic already. Chairman Bernanke of the Federal Reserve is one of the observers who has looked at the bill and said it will cut significant jobs. I believe his testimony was that it was not trivial, that it would be hundreds of thousands of jobs. Economist Mark Zandi has advised Republicans and Democrats. He is a neutral, independent economist. He has calculated that the GOP plan would cost 700,000 jobs. When we consider the good news that we have just heard of job growth in the past reporting period, which was, I believe, around 170,000 jobs—less than 200 anyway—the idea of wiping out 700,000 jobs acquires a real scale and a real significance.

Finally, at the bottom is Goldman Sachs. Goldman Sachs is no great friend of the Democratic Party. It is a group of financial advisers and investors who look at data as dispassionately as possible, because if they are wrong, they don't make money. Goldman Sachs has estimated that the spending cuts will hurt economic growth. My memory is, they estimated it would be 2 percentage points off of our economic growth. When we consider that our economic growth is under 3 percent right now, if we take two of the percents out, we are basically getting pretty close to flat-lining the American economy. So prudence dictates that we go about the necessary adjustments to get rid of our debt and our deficit in a way that does not snuff out the gradually emerging recovery.

In my State of Rhode Island, we have just gone from 11.5 percent unemployment down to 11.3 percent. It is still pretty darn serious out there. While clearly things appear to have bottomed out and started to go in the right direction, nothing prevents what everybody calls the double dip. Things such as the gas crisis we are experiencing now have been discussed as potentially creating a double dip. To knock out hundreds of thousands of jobs, to knock 2 full percentage points out of growth out of a ratio that is not much over 3 percent is a very big hit to the economy. It may be wiser to allow the economic recovery to continue a little bit further, as the Bowles-Simpson group recommended, that you couldn't snuff out the recovery early. Let the blaze catch a little more. Let it get going, and then we can move into these areas.

I will come to the floor later to talk about not just prudence but also fairness. There are two issues we need to address as we face up to our debt and deficit challenge. We have to do it prudently. We also should do it fairly. The way the House does it does not meet the standard either of prudence or fairness. On prudence, I think we have pretty strong agreement when Ben Bernanke and Mark Zandi and Goldman Sachs all talk about significant job losses as a result, and fairness is a topic for another day.

I yield the floor.

REMEMBERING JAMES ARTHUR ''ONION'' EASTHAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life and legacy of an upstanding hero of the Commonwealth, the late Mr. James Arthur ''Onion'' Eastham. A native of Somerset, KY, Mr. Eastham passed away peacefully on December 28, 2010. He was 87 years old.

Born in Pulaski County, KY, James not only served both his community and country selflessly, but touched the lives of all who had the pleasure of meeting him. His courageous and patriotic spirit led him to join the U.S. Marines Corps where he served as a staff sergeant and crew chief aboard a B–25 bomber, and in the Asiatic-Pacific Theater where he was awarded two Bronze Stars for duty at and during the Luzon and southern Philippine campaigns. He was also presented with the impressive award of the Philippine Liberation Ribbon with a Bronze Star for his bravery during combat with the enemy.

After the war, James continued to serve his community as a regional salesman for Morton Salt Company, as a longstanding member of the Kiwanis Club and the Somerset Masonic Lodge No. 111, and as a member of the First Baptist Church where he taught Sunday school and served as a chair of a building committee for the church's new sanctuary. It was no surprise that James's conscientious and excellent character earned him a spot on the Somerset City Council for 18 years, where he played active roles in helping to establish the Somerset Community College and finding a location for what is now the Lake Cumberland Regional Hospital. It is evident that both his family and the people of his close-knit community respected and valued James's tireless dedication and steadfast leadership, as he will always be fondly remembered as a man who stood firm in his beliefs.

I could surely continue to praise the works and accomplishments of this brave and humble man, but I will simply ask that my colleagues join me in remembering a true gentleman who poured his heart into serving, protecting, and strengthening his family, his country, and the Commonwealth. My thoughts go out to his beloved wife, Virginia; his three children, Jimmy, Wayne, and Lisa; his sister Edna; his grandchildren and great-grandchildren, and many other beloved friends and family members.

The Commonwealth Journal recently published an article about a contribution that was made in James's name to the Reid S. Jones Fund, a fund named in honor of his dear friend that helps veterans make educational advancements. I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Commonwealth Journal, Jan. 30, 2011]

FOUNDATION LAUNCHES REID S. JONES MEMORIAL FUND WITH CONTRIBUTION HONORING JAMES ''ONION'' EASTHAM

The Jones Educational Foundation Inc., a 501(C)3 not-for-profit corporation based in Somerset, has launched the Reid S. Jones Memorial Fund with a $1,000 contribution made by Dr. Sonya Jones honoring the late James Arthur ''Onion'' Eastham.

According to Dr. Jones, president and CEO of The Jones Foundation, the donation is intended to pay tribute to the friendship between James ''Onion'' Eastham, a man who was regarded highly in the Somerset community, and her father.

Further, the fund is meant to honor veterans from all the wars in which the United States has fought. The initial donation honors veterans who served in the European and Pacific theaters of World War II.

''I had been thinking about the Foundation setting up a fund for veterans in Dad's name ever since I made a donation in his memory to help restore the Soldiers and Sailors Memorial building at Union College,'' Mr. Jones said.

Reid Jones graduated from Union in 1959. He went on to do graduate work in education at Eastern Kentucky University.

''When Mr. Eastham passed away in late December, I knew it was time,'' Dr. Jones added. ''Dad thought so much of his friend that I felt he would want me to do something special to honor Onion's memory.''

Reid Sievers Jones (April 24, 1926 to April 15, 2005) entered the U.S. Army at a crucial point in the history of World War II. he was stationed in Germany, and he fought in the Battle of the Bulge. He was a survivor in what has been called ''one of the bloodiest battles'' of World War II.

Conducted in the dense, mountainous region of Belgium, the Battle of the Bulge was Adolf Hitler's last major offensive against the Allies. The battle ran from Dec. 16, 1944, until Jan. 25, 1945.

When he enlisted in the Army as a private, Reid Jones was 18 years of age. He married Elva Sears on Dec. 30, 1944, shortly before shipping out to the European front. He was promoted to the rank of staff sergeant and remained in Germany for a short time after the war to help begin the process of reconstruction.

James ''Onion'' Eastham (Sept. 22, 1923, to Dec. 28, 2010) served in the Asiatic-Pacific theater where he was awarded two bronze stars for duty at and during the Luzon and Southern Philippine campaigns. He also received the Philippine Liberation Ribbon with a bronze star for duty involving combat with the enemy.

Reid Jones and Onion Eastham were ''two of a kind,'' said Jimmy Eastham, son of the former Somerset City Council member who served as staff sergeant and crew chief aboard a B–25 bomber in the United States Marine Corp.

Jones and Eastham both were salesmen after the war. Jones worked for many years for Fram Corp. and Eastham for the Morton

Salt Co. The two men liked to get together and engage in the high art of Southern storytelling. Both formed strong friendships with other men in the Somerset community.

''Dad and Onion Eastham were part of a group of men who convened initially at Dad's car lot out on East Mt. Vernon Street, then at Dad's automotive parts store on Ogden Street in the building now owned by Dr. Byron Owens,'' Dr. Jones said.

''After Dad retired from Fram, he devoted most of his time to the automotive business and our family's rental properties,'' Dr. Jones continued.

''When Dad closed the automotive parts store housed in the same building with Mother's antiques and collectibles, he and his buddies met for coffee at the Sugar Shack over on the strip,'' she said.

Meeting for coffee was part of their ''daily routine,'' said Jimmy Eastham.

From time to time, the group also included Bobby Claunch, Howard Eastham, Ledger Howard, Penny Starnes, Don Stone, Jim Williams and Bob Williams in addition to Reid Jones and Onion Eastham.

Like his father, Jimmy Eastham served as a member of Somerset City Council. He and the Eastham family have given their enthusiastic endorsement to the Reid S. Memorial Fund with Dr. Jones' cornerstone contribution in memory of James ''Onion'' Eastham.

''It is a good idea to establish the fund even if it weren't done in the name of my father,'' Eastham said.

Both Reid Jones and James Eastham were ''very patriotic,'' according to Virginia Eastham, mother of Jimmy, Lisa (Bandy) and Wayne Eastham.

When Reid Jones returned from the war, he worked first as a teacher and principal in the Pulaski County and Somerset City school systems. He is remembered, particularly by former students at Shopville High School as a firm teacher who was not afraid to exercise discipline when he thought it was needed.

Later, in the 1960s, he joined Fram Corp., based in Providence, RI, as a district sales manager. Frequently, he was recognized for exceeding sales quotas. He was instrumental in placing Fram products in Wal-Marts across the southeastern United States.

Reid Jones was a 32nd degree Mason and a member of Oleika Shriners Temple in Lexington. He served on the board of directors of First United Methodist Church.

In addition to being an influential member of Somerset City Council, James ''Onion'' Eastham was a member of the Somerset Masonic Lodge #111 and a long-standing member of the Kiwanis Club. He was also a member of First Baptist Church where he taught Sunday school and served as chair of a building committee for the church's new sanctuary.

As a member of Somerset City Council from 1964 to 1982, Eastham played an active role in helping to establish Somerset Community College and finding a location for what is now Lake Cumberland Regional Hospital. He considered running for mayor, but his job as a regional salesman for Morton Salt Co. created time constraints that caused him not to seek office.

According to Clarence Love, city clerk during the years Eastham served on council, ''he was very conscientious.'' In Love's opinion, Eastham was an ''excellent councilman.''

Jimmy Eastham said he thought his father most likely would be remembered most for ''standing for what he believed in.''

The Reid S. Jones Memorial Fund was established, first and foremost, to help veterans with educational issues.

''A veteran might return from Afghanistan ready to go to law school and need some assistance,'' Dr. Jones said. ''Or, a veteran might return and want to become a law enforcement officer or a mechanic.''

As interest on the fund grows, money will be awarded to veterans who demonstrate great potential for success in professional and vocational arenas.

Primarily, the Reid S. Jones Memorial Fund intends to honor ''the warrior spirit,'' Dr. Jones said, ''the spirit of courage and bravery'' that has helped to keep the United States free.

The Reid S. Jones Memorial Fund is now open for tax-deductible contributions. Interested parties may e-mail Dr. Jones at: djones@jonesfoundation.net or phone her at 606–875–2967.

AMERICA INVENTS ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Congress has been working on the America Invents Act going back many years. It has gone through numerous iterations and changes have been made over time. Accordingly, I want to take a few minutes to discuss some important legislative history of a critical piece of this bill—section 2 of the legislation, which amends section 102 of title 35 of the United States Code. There has been a great deal of attention paid to subsections 102(a) and (b) and how those two subsections will work together. Senator BENNET and others have asked about this issue in particular.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator. I agree with the chairman that it is important that we set down a definitive legislative history of those subsections, which will be important for each and every patent application.

Mr. LEAHY. One key issue on which people have asked for clarification is the interplay between patent-defeating disclosures under subsection 102(a) and the situations where those disclosures are excepted and have no patent-defeating effect under the grace period provided in subsection 102(b).

In particular, some in the small inventor community have been concerned that a disclosure by an inventor might qualify as patent-defeating prior art under subsection 102(a) because, for example, the inventor's public disclosure and by a ''public disclosure'' I mean one that results in the claimed invention being ''described in a printed publication, or in public use, on sale, or otherwise available to the public''—might in some situation not be excluded as prior art under section 102(b)'s grace period. There is absolutely no situation in which this could happen given the interplay between subsections 102(a) and 102(b) as these subsections are drafted.

We intend that if an inventor's actions are such as to constitute prior art under subsection 102(a), then those actions necessarily trigger subsection 102(b)'s protections for the inventor and, what would otherwise have been section 102(a) prior art, would be excluded as prior art by the grace period provided by subsection 102(b). Indeed, as an example of this, subsection 102(b)(1)(A), as written, was deliberately couched in broader terms than subsection 102(a)(1). This means that any disclosure by the inventor whatsoever, whether or not in a form that resulted in the disclosure being available to the public, is wholly disregarded as prior art. A simple way of looking at new subsection 102(a) is that no aspect of the protections under current law for inventors who disclose their inventions before filing is in any way changed.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Vermont is correct. For the purposes of grace-period protection, the legislation intends parallelism between the treatment of an inventor's actions under subsection 102(a) that might create prior art and the treatment of those actions that negate any prior-art effect under subsection 102(b). Accordingly, small inventors and others will not accidentally create a patent-defeating bar by their prefiling actions that would otherwise be prior art under subsection 102(a) as long as they file their patent applications within the grace period provided by subsection 102(b). But, the important point is that if an inventor's disclosure triggers the 102(a) bar with respect to an invention, which can only be done by a disclosure that is both made available to the public and enabled, then he or she has thereby also triggered the grace period under 102(b). If a disclosure resulting from the inventor's actions is not one that is enabled, or is not made available to the public, then such a disclosure would not constitute patent-defeating prior art under 102(a) in the first place.

But even if the disclosure was enabled and available to the public so that it did qualify as prior art under subsection 102(a), subsection 102(b) would require that the disclosure be disregarded if it occurred during the 1-year grace period before the patent was sought. Indeed, a disclosure that does not satisfy the requirements to be prior art under subsection 102(a), nonetheless constitutes a disclosure that is fully protected under the more inclusive language of subsection 102(b). This relationship between these subsections will fully protect the inventor and, together with the provisions of subsection 101 limiting patenting to inventors, prevent others from obtaining a patent on the inventor's creation.

Mr. LEAHY. I agree. One of the implications of the point we are making is that subsection 102(a) was drafted in part to do away with precedent under current law that private offers for sale or private uses or secret processes practiced in the United States that result in a product or service that is then made public may be deemed patent-defeating prior art. That will no longer be the case. In effect, the new paragraph 102(a)(1) imposes an overarching requirement for availability to the public, that is a public disclosure, which will limit paragraph 102(a)(1) prior art to subject matter meeting the public accessibility standard that is well-settled in current law, especially case law of the Federal Circuit.

Mr. HATCH. An additional clarification we have been asked about deals

with subparagraph 102(b)(1)(B). There has been some confusion over how this provision will work. It is my understanding that this provision ensures that an inventor who has made a public disclosure—that is, a disclosure made available to the public by any means—is fully protected during the grace period. The inventor is protected not only from the inventor's own disclosure being prior art against the inventor's claimed invention, but also against the disclosures of any of the same subject matter in disclosures made by others being prior art against the inventor's claimed invention under section 102(a) or section 103—so long as the prior art disclosures from others came after the public disclosure by the inventor. Is that the Senators' understanding of this provision?

Mr. LEAHY. That is correct. Subparagraph 102(b)(1)(B) is designed to work in tandem with subparagraph 102(b)(1)(A) to make a very strong grace period for inventors that have made a public disclosure before seeking a patent. Inventors who have made such disclosures are protected during the grace period, not only from their own disclosure, but also from disclosures by others that are made after their disclosure. This is an important protection we offer in our bill that will benefit independent and university inventors in particular.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SPECIALIST JOSHUA R. CAMPBELL

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the life and heroic service of SPC Joshua R. Campbell. Specialist Campbell, assigned to the 546th Transportation Company, based in Fort Bragg, NC, died on January 29, 2011, of injuries sustained when an improvised explosive device detonated near his vehicle. Specialist Campbell was serving in support of Operation Enduring Freedom in Helmand Province, Afghanistan. He was 22 years old.

A native of Bennett, CO, Specialist Campbell enlisted in the Army in 2008. He served a tour of duty in Afghanistan, during which his commanders recognized his extraordinary bravery and talent. Specialist Campbell's decorations include the Army Good Conduct Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, and the NATO Medal.

During his 2 years of service, Specialist Campbell distinguished himself through his courage, dedication to duty, and absolute commitment to his fellow soldiers. Fellow soldiers remember him as a consummate professional with an unending commitment to excellence. They remember his generous character and positive disposition.

Specialist Campbell's family remembers him as a dedicated son, husband, and father. They also remember him as someone always willing to reach out and help others.

Mark Twain once said, ''The fear of death follows from the fear of life. A man who lives fully is prepared to die at any time.'' Specialist Campbell's service was in keeping with this sentiment—by selflessly putting country first, he lived life to the fullest. He lived with a sense of the highest honorable purpose.

At substantial personal risk, he braved the chaos of combat zones throughout Afghanistan. And though his fate on the battlefield was uncertain, he pushed forward, protecting America's citizens, her safety, and the freedoms we hold dear. For his service and the lives he touched, Specialist Campbell will forever be remembered as one of our country's bravest.

To Specialist Campbell's entire family—I cannot imagine the sorrow you must be feeling. I hope that, in time, the pain of your loss will be eased by your pride in Joshua's service and by your knowledge that his country will never forget him. We are humbled by his service and his sacrifice.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY 2011

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for International Women's Day.

Since the beginning of last century, determined and courageous women have fought hard and made important strides towards ensuring that women are guaranteed equality and basic human rights. Too often in the past, women were seen as victims that needed to be protected or saved. But today, on the 100th anniversary of International Women's Day, women should be viewed as they really are: farmers, entrepreneurs, businesswomen, teachers, policewomen, caretakers, doctors, lawyers, politicians, mothers, wives, astronauts and presidents.

While we should reflect on incredible progress that women have made in pushing for greater rights and equal opportunities, we must be vigilant about the facts on the status of women around the world. We know women are still being discriminated against; still being abused; and still being treated unjustly. We know about the trafficking of young women and girls; the lack of maternal health care; the lack of access to an education or basic economic opportunities. These are the facts.

What we also know is that empowering women around the world to participate in the political, social and economic life of their communities and their families is one of the most important tools that we have to alleviate poverty. Decades of research and experience prove that when women are able to be fully engaged in society and hold decision making power, they are more likely to invest their income in food, clean water, education, and health care for their children. This creates a positive cycle of change that lifts entire families, communities and nations out of poverty. Simply put, when women succeed, we all do.

Right now, over a billion people worldwide live on a dollar a day or less let's be conscious of the fact that women are most likely to be among them. This is a problem that affects all of humanity—when women are poor, entire communities suffer because they are not free to earn an income, feed their families, or protect themselves and their children from violence. And their efforts are critical to rebuilding fragile countries like Afghanistan and Haiti. Until women around the world have improved access to economic, political and social opportunities, the great challenges we face today will go unresolved.

Many people do not realize is that violence against women and girls is a major source of poverty. Violence and poverty go hand and hand. Violence prevents women and girls from getting an education, going to work, and earning the income they need to lift their families out of poverty. We know that one in three women will be the victim of physical or sexual abuse in her lifetime. But we also know that women have the potential to lift families and communities out of poverty.

And this undeniable connection means that we cannot ignore or sacrifice women's rights for political expediency. If meaningful reforms for women are rolled back or not implemented at all, particularly in places like Afghanistan, real and sustainable development will fail. Although conditions for women in Afghanistan have improved since the fall of the Taliban in 2001, they still face serious challenges in many aspects of life. And we cannot accept the status quo that women face in many of these countries as the ''cost of doing business.'' The U.S. government must continue to press the fundamental values of the rights of women—to vote, to attend school, to own land, to live their lives without violence, to make their own choices—if we expect to see a sustainable peace in Afghanistan.

Even in countries not in a state of conflict, women's equality and access can make the difference between life and death for her family. Janet Wamalwa owns a 1-acre farm plot in rural Kenya that used to lay bare and was difficult to cultivate. Like many areas of sub-Saharan Africa, her land was plagued by soil erosion and low productivity. And for a subsistence farmer like 32-year-old Janet, when her crops don't grow, her family doesn't eat. And when the mother of five could not make ends meet, the first cost-savings remedy was to pull the children from their studies. To save money, Janet said that they lived on one meal a day during the dry season.

But no more. Today, Janet's crops are thriving and her family is eating better because of several sustainable farming techniques she implemented with the help of an international NGO and Kenya's Ministry of Agriculture. Janet's approach is just one example of how small-scale farmers in Africa—

most of whom are women—can use a diversity of simple practices to stave off hunger, earn an income and, ultimately, improve their lives, and the lives of those around them. And for Janet, the benefits have been life-changing. Now, she said her children's overall nutrition is better. Meanwhile, the extra income Janet earns from selling products in local markets means she can pay her children's school fees.

If we ignore the reality and the influence of empowering women, the results will undoubtedly be negative. When development programs fail to consider gender differences, women are the ones that are left behind. The World Bank states that, at the macroeconomic level, there is evidence that removing gender disparities spurs growth. According to one estimate, growth rates in Africa, South Asia, and the Middle East would have been 30–45 percent higher had these regions closed the gender gaps as East Asia did during the school years of 1960 and 1992. In Kenya, if women farmers were given the same level of agricultural inputs and education as men, they could increase their yields by more than 20 percent.

Therefore, if we open women's access to the means of agricultural production such as: farming land, fertilizers, farm labor, credit and technical skills—the end results are crucial to guaranteeing food security and enhancing the nutritional status of children. When we invest in women and they have the opportunity to augment their own incomes, their families and communities thrive.

As we in Congress and in the administration move forward with the vital process of revamping and modernizing our foreign assistance, we have an opportunity to make women's empowerment a central focus of U.S. foreign policy. We must all remember the lesson that an investment in the empowerment of women is an investment in the future. As chairman of the International Development and Foreign Assistance Subcommittee at Foreign Relations, I vow to make that the case. Investing in women is the best way to secure stronger communities and economies around the world.

Today, let us reaffirm the commitment to end gender-based discrimination in all forms, to end violence against women and girls worldwide, as we encourage the people of the United States to observe March 8 as International Women's Day.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO TRACY VALENTINE

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to an outstanding Arkansas educator, Tracy Valentine.

A teacher at Bragg Elementary School in West Memphis, Tracy is a recipient of the 2010 Milken Educator Award.

This prestigious award is the Nation's preeminent teacher recognition program that has honored 2,500 teachers, principals and specialists with $25,000 awards. The criteria for selection of this award is exceptional educational talent as evidenced by outstanding instructional practices in the classroom, school and professional and policy leadership, and an engaging and inspiring presence that motivates and impacts students, colleagues and the community. Tracy surpassed these criteria. Her outstanding contributions and commitment to education have been noticed by her students, their parents as well as her colleagues.

Tracy's passion for educating not only helps students, but also inspires those who work with her to do their best to encourage further development in the classroom. This truly is a major accomplishment in her career and something of which to be very proud.

I would like to offer my appreciation for Tracy Valentine's determination and devotion to provide a quality educational experience for students as we continue to shape the eager, young minds of West Memphis and work to keep America globally competitive.•

TRIBUTE TO NANCY WILSON COOK

• Mr. CARPER. Mr. President. today I recognize the Honorable Nancy Wilson Cook of Kenton, DE. A legislator, stateswoman, sister, mother, grandmother and friend, I have known Nancy for many years and on many levels. I am very proud to be honoring her today.

Born in Philadelphia, Nancy grew up in New Castle County and attended public school in the Colonial School District, graduating from William Penn High School. Nancy also attended the University of Delaware before marrying her beloved husband, the Honorable Allen J. Cook, and starting their family.

Always curious about the political process, Nancy got her first taste of the political world when she worked as an attaché to the late State Senator Calvin McCullough. For the next 20 years Nancy worked in Legislative Hall, in the Capital City of Dover, taking in the democratic process. Following the passing of her husband, Nancy was elected to the 15th District Senate seat held by Allen, during a special election.

A role model of integrity and service, Nancy served not only as a State senator, but as a leader within the Democratic caucus. Nancy served as chairwoman and vice-chairwoman of the prestigious Joint Finance Committee, and is the longest-serving Joint Finance Committee cochair in Delaware history. As the first Democratic woman to be elected to the Delaware State Senate, Nancy held other leadership roles during her tenure including serving as senate majority whip, chairwoman of the Senate Highways and Transportation Committee, and chairwoman of the Joint Capital Bond Bill Committee. She also served as a member of the Senate Committees on Agriculture; Adult & Juvenile Corrections; Children, Youth & Families; Insurance & Elections; and, Revenue & Taxation.

An icon in the Delaware General Assembly, Nancy's legislative accomplishments are vast. During my terms as both Delaware's treasurer and Governor, Nancy and I worked closely together on many financial issues facing the State of Delaware. Known for her immense knowledge of and experience with Delaware financial matters, I valued her input on many major decisions.

Throughout my 8 years as Delaware's Governor, Nancy's leadership helped my administration pursue a commonsense agenda that led to eight balanced budgets, tax cuts in 7 of those 8 years, and major increases in employment allowing Delaware to achieve a AAA bond rating for the first time in its history. Nancy has been a strong ally for me on many occasions including creating Delaware's 21st Century Fund, the unprecedented State long-term infrastructure investment fund. In 1996, she was a very strong supporter of the purchase of the Port of Wilmington, which began the port's rejuvenation into one of the world's top ports.

Another of her many noteworthy accomplishments was in the late 1970s and early 1980s with the enacting of the constitutional amendments and related legislation to establish Delaware's balanced budget amendment—creating the State's ''Rainy Day Fund'' and a formula for reducing bond indebtedness. Nancy was also very active with the Legislative Council leading the way for the conversion and renovation of both Legislative Hall and the Tatnall Building allowing for better public access to the General Assembly and the Governor. She has also been a strong supporter of the Wilmington Riverfront, serving on the board of directors of the Riverfront Development Corporation, as well as information technology, historical and cultural affairs and the Delaware Heritage Commission's Delaware Oral History Project.

Nancy leaves a legacy of commitment to public service for her family and the rest of us to follow. I join her friends and family, son Tommy, his wife Beth and their daughter Morgan; stepson Allen, his wife Judy and their children Allen III, Dale, and Shawn and their wives and children in congratulating Nancy for her dedication and service.

On behalf of all Delawareans, I applaud Nancy W. Cook for her outstanding commitment to the State of Delaware and extend to her my very best wishes for every success in the future.•

2010 ALFRED P. SLOAN AWARD WINNERS

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, today I congratulate the 2010 winners of the Alfred P. Sloan Award for Business Excellence in Workplace Flexibility. This award recognizes employers that have

created a culture of workplace flexibility in policy and practice. The Sloan Awards are presented nationally by the When Work Works initiative, an effort of the Families and Work Institute in partnership with the Institute for a Competitive Workforce, an affiliate of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the Twiga Foundation Inc. The When Work Works initiative is sponsored by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.

I draw your attention to the Sloan Award winners because I think these companies are to be commended for their commitment to implementing workplace flexibility practices which benefit both employees and employers. Integrating various workplace flexibility options is instrumental to creating a healthy work environment for today's dynamic and changing workforce.

Businesses in the following 28 communities were eligible for recognition in the 2010 Sloan Awards: Arizona, statewide; Aurora, CO; Boise, ID; Charleston, SC; Chicago, IL; Dallas, TX; Dayton, OH; Durham, NC; Georgia, statewide; Houston, TX; Kentucky, statewide; Long Beach, CA; Long Island, NY; Louisville, KY; Melbourne-Palm Bay, FL; Michigan, statewide; Milwaukee, WI; Morris County, NJ; New Hampshire, statewide; Providence, RI; Richmond, VA; Rochester, MN; Salt Lake City, UT; San Francisco, CA; Seattle, WA; Spokane, WA; Twin Cities, MN; and Winona, MN. In addition, there are several winners recognized in the at-large category. The Chamber of Commerce or other lead organization in each city hosted an interactive business forum to share research on workplace flexibility as an important component of workplace effectiveness. In these same communities, businesses applied for, and winners were selected for, the Sloan Awards through a process that included employees' views as well as employer practices.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the 2010 winners of the Alfred P. Sloan Award for Business Excellence in Workplace Flexibility. These businesses are to be commended for their excellence in providing workplace flexibility.

In Arizona the winners are Arizona Foundation for Legal Services and Education; Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System; Arizona Small Business Association; Barich Inc; BDO USA, LLP; Chandler Chamber of Commerce; Chandler-Gilbert Community College; Clifton Gunderson LLP; Custom Accounting & Tax; Henry & Horne, LLP; Infincom; Intel Corporation; Johnson Bank; Keats, Connelly and Associates, LLC; McGladrey; Microchip Technology, Inc.; Morrison & Associates CPAs; Motorola, Inc.; Omega Legal Systems, Inc.; Orchard Medical Consulting; Point B; Raytheon Missile Systems; Ryan, Inc.; Scottsdale Healthcare; Southwest Institute of Natural Aesthetics; Verde Valley Sanctuary; Western International University—Peoria; Wist Office Products; and WorldatWork.

In Aurora, CO, the winners are Arapahoe/Douglas Works!; Aurora Mental Health Center; E–470 Public Highway Authority; and McGladrey.

In Boise, ID, the winners are American Geotechnics; Givens Pursley LLP; and Idaho Emergency Physicians.

In Charleston, SC, the winners are Booz Allen Hamilton; Charleston Metro Chamber of Commerce; Community Management Group; Dixon Hughes PLLC; Go To Team; KFR Services, Inc.; Morris Financial Concepts, Inc; Santee Cooper; Scientific Research Corporation; and South Carolina Aquarium.

In Chicago, IL, the winners are Deloitte, LLP; Draftcb; Ernst & Young; Falkor Group, LLC; Frost, Ruttenberg & Rothblatt, P.C.; KPMG LLP; McGladrey; Microsoft Corporation; Ryan, Inc.; Turner Construction Company—Chicago; and Wellbuilt Equipment Inc.

In Dallas, TX, the winners are Abernethy Media Professionals, Inc.; Aguirre Roden, Inc.; BDO USA, LLP; Big Brothers Big Sisters; Capital One Financial Corporation; Dallas Convention & Visitors Bureau; Deloitte LLP; Ernst & Young LLP; KPMG LLP; Lockheed Martin Missiles and Fire Control; McQueary Henry Bowles Troy LLP; Medical City Dallas Hospital; Ryan, Inc.; and The North Highland Company.

In Dayton, OH, the winners are Azimuth Corporation; Cornerstone Research Group; Deloitte; MacAulay-Brown Inc.; and Sebaly Shillito + Dyer.

In Durham, NC, the winners are Durham Convention and Visitors Bureau; Durham's Partnership for Children; McKinney; Mount Olive College at Research Triangle; and U.S. EPA—Research Triangle Park.

In Georgia the winners are BDO USA, LLP; Booz Allen Hamilton; Deloitte LLP; Gas South, LLC; Hancock Askew & Co., LLP; KPMG LLP; Merrick & Company; Ryan, Inc.; and WellStar Health System.

In Houston, TX, the winners are Access Sciences Corporation; BDO USA, LLP; Binkley & Barfield, Inc.; Brown & Gay Engineers, Inc.; CenterPoint Energy; City of Houston/E.B. Cape Center; ContentActive LLC; Deloitte LLP; El Paso Corporation; Ernst & Young LLP; HBL Architects; Houston-Galveston Area Council; Klotz Associates, Inc.; KPMG LLP; Memorial Hermann Healthcare System; Pannell Kerr Forster of Texas, P.C.; Ryan, Inc.; The Dow Chemical Company; The VIA Group; Traffic Engineers, Inc.; and University of Phoenix Houston Campus.

In Kentucky, the winners are AASHE; Alexander & Company, PSC; Anneken, Huey & Moser PLLC; Benefit Insurance Marketing; Employee Resource Group, LLC; Fowler Measle & Bell PLLC; Kentucky Employers' Mutual Insurance; Lexington Habitat for Humanity; Lexmark International, Inc; Riney Hancock CPAs, PSC; Software Information Systems, LLC; and Sturgill, Turner, Barker & Moloney PLLC.

In Long Beach, CA, the winners are AES Alamitos, LLC; BDO USA, LLP; Bryson Financial Group; Deloitte LLP—Costa Mesa; Deloitte LLP—Los Angeles; KPMG LLP; Long Beach Rescue Mission; and P2S Engineering, Inc.

In Long Island, NY, the winners are BDO USA, LLP; Cerini & Associates LLP; Creative Plan Designs, Ltd.; Deloitte LLP; KPMG LLP; Margolin, Winer, & Evens LLP; SilvermanAcampora LLP; and YES Community Counseling Center.

In Louisville, KY, the winners are A Speaker For You; Big Brother Big Sisters of Kentuckiana; Center for Accessible Living, Inc.; Community Coordinated Child Care (4–C); Deloitte LLP; DMLO; Frankfort Regional Medical Center; Greater Louisville Inc.; JC Malone Associates; KiZAN Technologies LLC; KPMG LLP; Louis T. Roth & Co.; McCauley, Nicolas & Company, LLC; Next Wave Systems LLC; Prestige Health Care; and The CMOOR Group.

In Melbourne-Palm Bay, FL, the winners are Courtyard by Marriott Melbourne-West Palm Bay; Craig Technologies; McGladrey; and Space Coast Business, LLC.

In Michigan the statewide winners are Amerisure Insurance; Atomic Object LLC; BDO USA, LLP; Brown & Brown of Detroit; Educational Data Systems, Inc.; E–IT Professionals Corp.; Ernst & Young Detroit; Ernst & Young Grand Rapids; Farbman Group; Kapnick Insurance Group; KPMG LLP; Menlo Innovations LLC; Michigan Health & Hospital Association; Michigan Occupational Safety and Health Administration; National Multiple Sclerosis Society, Michigan Chapter; Peckham Inc.; Plex Systems; Public Policy Associates, Inc.; Ryan, Inc.; Service Express, Inc. (SEI); Sphinx Organization; Visteon Corporation; and Warner Norcross & Judd LLP.

In Milwaukee, WI, the winners are BDO USA, LLP; Clifton Gunderson LLP; Deloitte LLP; Ernst & Young, LLP; Herzing University; Kolb+Co SC; KPMG LLP; Laughlin/Constable; Manpower, Inc.; McGladrey; Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce; Microsoft Corporation; Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corporation; Robert W. Baird & Co.; and The Novo Group.

In Morris County, NJ, the winners are DMC Athletics and Rehabilitation; Family Service of Morris County; KPMG LLP; NJ Foundation for the Blind; and and Solix Inc.

In New Hampshire the winners are MeetingMatrix International; Inc.; Northeast Delta Dental; and Student Conservation Association.

In Providence, RI, the winners are KPMG LLP; Rhode Island Housing; Rhode Island Legal Services, Inc.; and Sansiveri, Kimball, and Company, LLP.

In Richmond, VA, the winners are BDO USA, LLP; Bon Secours Richmond Health System; Capital One Financial Corporation, Rink and Vaco Richmond, LLC.

In Rochester, MN, the winners are Cardinal of Minnesota, Ltd.; Custom

Alarm/Custom Communications; First Alliance Credit Union; Intercultural Mutual Assistance Association; market; McGladrey; Rochester Area Family Y; Southeast Service Cooperative; Stanley Jones & Associates; University of Minnesota Rochester; and Winona State University Rochester.

In Salt Lake City, UT, the winners are 1–800 CONTACTS, Inc.; Café Rio Mexican Grill; Christopherson Business Travel; CRSA; Deloitte LLP; Employer Solutions Group; Futura Industries; Intermountain Financial Group, LLC; Intermountain Healthcare; McKinnon-Mulherin, Inc.; Nelson Labs, Inc.; Software Technology Group; and Utah Food Services.

In San Francisco, CA the winners are BDO USA, LLP and KPMG LLP.

In Seattle, WA, the winners are Bader Martin, P.S.; BECU; Blue Gecko; Cascadia Consulting Group, Inc.; Deloitte LLP; EdLab Group; National CASA Association; nrg::seattle; People For Puget Sound; Peterson Sullivan LLP; Prolumina; Senior Services; SH Worldwide, LLC; Snohomish County Human Resources; Talaris Institute; Technology Services Company, Inc.; Washington State Hospital Association; and WithinReach.

In Spokane, WA, the winners are Associated Industries of the Inland Northwest; CHRM Hill—Spokane; and Humanix Staffing and Recruiting.

In the Twin Cities the winners are Carlson; Deloitte LLP; Dorsey & Whitney LLP; Ernst & Young; Health Dimensions Group; KPMG LLP; Mahoney, Ulbrich, Christiansen Russ PA; McGladrey; MRM Minneapolis; Spanlink Communications; and Western National Mutual Insurance Company.

In Winona, MN, the winners are Catholic Charities of the Diocese on Winona; Mediascope, Inc.; Merchants Bank; Sport & Spine Physical Therapy of Winona Inc.; Thern Inc; and Winona Workforce Center.

The At-large winners are BioPharm Systems, San Mateo, CA; Bon Secours Hampton Roads, Norfolk, VA; Center for Seabees & Facilities Engineering, Port Hueneme, CA; Cisco Systems Inc., San Jose, CA; cSubs, Ramsey, NJ; Executive Transport Detachment, Sigonella, Sigonella, Italy; FeatureTel LLC, Apex, NC; George Mason University—Fairfax campus, Fairfax, VA; J.A. Counter & Associates, Inc., New Richmond, WI; Machen, McChesney & Chastain, LLP, Auburn, AL; Marine Corps Recruit Depot San Diego, San Diego, CA; Merrick & Company, Albuquerque, NM; Merrick & Company, Oakridge, TN; Naval Aviation Forecast Detachment Sembach, Sembach, Germany; Naval Education and Training Command, Pensacola, FL; Naval Submarine Support Command Pearl Harbor, Pearl Harbor, HI; Pride Inc., Bismarck, ND; SiteCrafting, Inc., Tacoma, WA; State Farm Insurance, Austin, TX; Technomics, Inc., Arlington, VA; and USN Explosive Ordnance Disposal Training and Evaluation Unit TWO, Virginia Beach, VA.

Companies with at-large winners in multiple cities are BDO USA, LLP; KPMG LLP; McGladrey; and Ryan, Inc.

Again, I congratulate the 2010 winners of the Sloan awards and look forward to the ongoing recognition of this worthwhile initiative.●

BOB LEVINSON'S DISAPPEARANCE

● Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, 4 years ago yesterday, a man who had spent more than 28 years serving the United States of America disappeared from Kish Island in the Persian Gulf. His name is Bob Levinson, and he is a dedicated husband and father, a retired FBI agent, and one of my constituents.

Today Bob Levinson remains missing, and we must bring him home.

On March 8, 2007, Bob traveled to Kish, an Iranian free trade zone, on a business trip. From what we know, he checked into his hotel, checked out on March 9, got into a taxi, and then disappeared.

In the 4 years since then, I have worked closely with the State Department and the Swiss government to lodge a number of requests for information with the Iranian government. Bob's wife Christine has traveled to Iran and visited Kish on a fact-finding mission. She and her children have remained steadfast and determined in their mission to bring Bob home.

Just last week, Secretary Clinton offered a glimmer of hope: we now have recent indications that Bob is alive and being held somewhere in Southwest Asia. Secretary Clinton also asked the Government of Iran to undertake humanitarian efforts to return him home safely.

Today, on the fourth anniversary of Bob's disappearance, I join Secretary Clinton's call for the Government of Iran to do all it can to reunite Bob Levinson with his family. The Iranians have long offered their assistance, and now it's time for them to make good on that commitment.

Christine Levinson and her children have waited 4 long years for Bob to come home. It is time to grant their wish.●

RECOGNIZING PORTAGE WOODS PRODUCTS, LLC.

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, since settlers first occupied the vast forest areas found in my home State of Maine, the logging industry has been a vital part of the state's economy. Last year, approximately 2,600 were employed by the forestry and logging industry, and over 4,000 were employed in wood product manufacturing. Maine loggers have constantly been at the forefront of advances in their industry, including inventing the Peavey hook and the Lombard log hauler. Despite these great advancements, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, OSHA, considers logging to be one of the most dangerous industries in the United States. Today I commend and recognize Portage Woods Products LLC, a logging company in my home State of Maine, for receiving the Safety and Health Achievement Recognition Program, SHARP, award, OSHA's highest honor for small businesses that show an exemplary commitment to workplace safety and health.

Portage Woods Products LLC, a division of Maine Woods Company LLC, located in the northern Maine town of Portage, knows what it takes to be a successful small business without compromising safety and integrity. The Pingree family has been invested in logging since 1841. Currently their small business employs 63 individuals and distributes $2.6 million in payroll. In 2006, the Pingrees acquired and integrated Portage Woods Products, or PWP, into Maine Woods Company. The Portage Woods site is the only fully integrated hardwood manufacturing complex in the Northeast.

Throughout its history, PWP has strived to uphold its mission, ''to manufacture quality hardwood lumber at the lowest cost while providing for a safe work environment.'' To do so, the firm incorporates accident prevention into its training of employees, and asks workers to remember that, ''no job is more important than your safety!''

Clearly, Portage Woods Products makes safety a priority, and in December 2010 OSHA recognized this aspect of the business by honoring the company with the SHARP award. This is truly distinctive, as less than 1,600 small worksites currently possess this honor. I commend the company's high achievement and its laudable commitment to safety. I know firsthand that small businesses face unparalleled burdens in complying with all types of regulations, which only makes this accomplishment all the more impressive.

Portage Woods Products has demonstrated that when a company sets goals and prides itself on safety, it is possible to attain excellence. I thank everyone at PWP and Maine Woods Company for their dedication and commitment to a safe and productive work environment, and offer my best wishes for another 150 years of success.●

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES ''CHUCK'' WIELGUS

● Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Charles ''Chuck'' Wielgus of Colorado Springs, a recipient of the 2010 Great Comebacks Award for the Western Region. This award honors 12 individuals throughout the United States who have struggled with a chronic intestinal condition and have exhibited extraordinary strength and courage in fighting to ensure that this condition does not affect their ability to live life on their terms.

Chuck was serving as executive director of USA Swimming in 2006 when he was diagnosed with stage III colorectal cancer. His diagnosis required radiation and chemotherapy therapy, as

well as ostomy surgery. With the constant support of his swimming family, as well as the inspiration given him by his wife Nancy, Chuck was quickly able to regain his fighting spirit.

Four years removed from his ordeal, Chuck is as active as ever. In 2008, Chuck traveled to China with the U.S. Swim Team for the Beijing Olympic Games. Aside from his role with USA Swimming, Chuck is the chief executive officer of the USA Swimming Foundation, and is looking forward to taking on the responsibility of helping others through sharing his personal story of triumph.

There are thousands of brave Coloradans who share Chuck's story, and it is an honor for me to be able to tell that story here, for the record. I congratulate Chuck and the other Great Comebacks Award recipients for 2010, and I urge my colleagues to take the time to learn more about the struggles brave citizens such as Chuck face in your own respective States. Their stories, like Chuck's, are inspirational; with help from all of my colleagues here today, we can together begin to heighten awareness about some of the huge strides being made by people living with intestinal diseases or recovering from ostomy surgery.●

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLAND COUNTY, VIRGINIA

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, today I recognize Bland County, VA, which celebrates its sesquicentennial this month.

Bland County possesses the strong sense of community that makes Virginia an outstanding place to live and work. The county has a rich history, and is the only county in the Commonwealth that came into being during the Civil War.

Called ''the land between the tunnels'' because of its unique location, Bland County has more miles of the Appalachian Trail than any other county and contains more than 76,970 acres of the Jefferson National Forest. It is a place where people are willing and eager to work, and where the spirit of independence runs freely and fiercely along its ridges and through its valleys.

Bland County will commemorate the 150th anniversary of its founding with celebrations held on March 30, the date the county received its charter from the Commonwealth of Virginia. I would like to offer my congratulations to the citizens of Bland on this milestone anniversary and wish them continued prosperity in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mrs. Neiman, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 525. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance and increase the number of veterinarians trained in veterinary public health; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 570. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance the roles of dentists and allied dental personnel in the Nation's disaster response framework, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:30 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 525. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance and increase the number of veterinarians trained in veterinary public health.

H.R. 570. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance the roles of dentists of allied dental personnel in the Nation's disaster response framework, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

From the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with amendments:

S. 493. A bill to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–849. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–850. A communication from the Director, Office of Surface Mining , Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Montana Regulatory Program'' (Docket No. MT–031–FOR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2011; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–851. A communication from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Louisiana Regulatory Program/Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Plan'' (Docket No. LA–023–FOR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2011; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–852. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Application of ASTM Standard Practice C1671-07 When Performing Technical Reviews of Spent Fuel Storage and Transportation Packaging Licensing Actions'' (Interim Staff Guidance Document No. 23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–853. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''403(b) Plan Terminations'' (Revenue Ruling 2011–7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–854. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the Department of State on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the periods October 1, 2010 through November 30, 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–855. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services, pursuant to the MINER Act of 2006; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. VITTER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. WICKER, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 516. A bill to extend outer Continental Shelf leases to accommodate permitting delays and to provide operators time to meet new drilling and safety requirements; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KYL, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 517. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants for States to implement minimum and enhanced DNA collection processes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. RISCH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 518. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an exclusion for assistance provided to participants in certain veterinary student loan repayment or forgiveness programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. ENSIGN, Mrs. BOXER, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 519. A bill to further allocate and expand the availability of hydroelectric power generated at Hoover Dam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 520. A bill to repeal the Volumetric Ethanol Excise Tax Credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 521. A bill for the relief of Tim Lowery and Paul Nettleton of Owyhee County, Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 522. A bill to clarify the rights and responsibilities of Federal entities in the spectrum relocation process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 523. A bill to provide for enhanced criminal penalties for individuals who file a SEVP certification petition under false pretenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 524. A bill to terminate certain hydropower reservations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 525. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for integration of mental health services and mental health treatment outreach teams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. KYL):

S. 526. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Bureau of Land Management land in Mohave County, Arizona, to the Arizona Game and Fish Commission, for use as a public shooting range; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DEMINT (for himself, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. COBURN):

S. 527. A bill to amend the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 to terminate the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to provide new assistance under the Home Affordable Modification Program, while preserving assistance to homeowners who were already extended an offer to participate in the Program, either on a trial or permanent basis; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 528. A bill to provide driver safety grants to States with graduated driver licensing laws that meet certain minimum requirements; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 529. A bill to extend the temporary duty suspensions on certain cotton shirting fabrics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. WEBB):

S. 530. A bill to modify certain subsidies for ethanol production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WEBB (for himself and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 531. A bill to amend section 5542 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that any hours worked by Federal firefighters under a qualified trade-of-time arrangement shall be excluded for purposes of determinations relating to overtime pay; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 532. A bill to establish the Patriot Express Loan Program under which the Small Business Administration may make loans to members of the military community wanting to start or expand small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. 533. A bill to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BURR, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. TESTER, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 534. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain small producers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. CHAMBLISS):

S. 535. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain lands within Fort Pulaski National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WEBB:

S. 536. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that utilization of survivors' and dependents' educational assistance shall not be subject to the 48-month limitation on the aggregate amount of assistance utilizable under multiple veterans and related educational assistance programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WEBB:

S. 537. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States Executive Directors of the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose the provision of any loan or financial or technical assistance for a project for the construction of hydroelectric dams or electricity transmission systems in the Mekong River Basin unless the Secretary makes certain assurances with respect to the project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. Res. 96. A resolution congratulating the Army Dental Corps on its 100th anniversary; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. BURR):

S. Res. 97. A resolution affirming the importance of exercise and physical activity as key components of a healthy lifestyle, including in combating obesity, reducing chronic disease, and lowering health care costs; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 228

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 228, a bill to preempt regulation of, action relating to, or consideration of greenhouse gases under Federal and common law on enactment of a Federal policy to mitigate climate change.

S. 296

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 296, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide the Food and Drug Administration with improved capacity to prevent drug shortages.

S. 312

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 312, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal certain limitations on health care benefits.

S. 344

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 344, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 358

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 358, a bill to codify and modify regulatory requirements of Federal agencies.

S. 359

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 359, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the expansion of information reporting requirements to payments made to corporations, payments for property and other gross proceeds, and rental property expense payments, and for other purposes.

S. 398

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 398, a bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to improve energy efficiency of certain appliances and equipment, and for other purposes.

S. 414

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) were added as cosponsors of S. 414, a bill to protect girls in developing countries through the prevention

of child marriage, and for other purposes.

S. 474

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 474, a bill to reform the regulatory process to ensure that small businesses are free to compete and to create jobs, and for other purposes.

S. 496

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 496, a bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act to repeal a duplicative program relating to inspection and grading of catfish.

S. 501

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 501, a bill to establish pilot projects under the Medicare program to provide incentives for home health agencies to utilize home monitoring and communications technologies.

S. 509

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 509, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act, to advance the ability of credit unions to promote small business growth and economic development opportunities, and for other purposes.

S. 512

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 512, a bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out programs to develop and demonstrate 2 small modular nuclear reactor designs, and for other purposes.

S. 514

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 514, a bill to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service.

S. RES. 51

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 51, a resolution recognizing the 190th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating Greek and American democracy.

S. RES. 87

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 87, a resolution designating the year of 2012 as the ''International Year of Cooperatives''.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KYL, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 517. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants for States to implement minimum and enhanced DNA collection processes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Katie Sepich Enhanced DNA Collection Act of 2011. I am pleased that Senators KYL, UDALL of New Mexico, SCHUMER, and BENNET of Colorado are joining me today in sponsoring this important piece of legislation. Congressman SCHIFF and REICHERT are also introducing this bipartisan bill in the House.

Similar legislation, which was championed in the House of Representatives by Congressman TEAGUE, overwhelmingly passed that body last year with a bipartisan vote of 357 to 32. Unfortunately, efforts to move the legislation last year were unsuccessful in the Senate. I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass this bipartisan bill in the Senate this Congress.

The bill is named after Katie Sepich, a promising graduate student attending New Mexico State University who was tragically murdered in 2003. The man who killed Katie was arrested for aggravated assault about 3 months after the murder. Although police had collected the killer's DNA from the crime scene, because there was no requirement that DNA be taken from individuals arrested for serious felonies, police weren't able to get a match until about 3 years after the murder when the man was sent to prison after being convicted of unrelated crimes.

If New Mexico had the arrestee law then that it has today it would have taken 3 months, not 3 years, to solve the crime. Katie's mother, Jayann, has worked tirelessly at the state and Federal level to give law enforcement the tools they need to promptly solve crimes and ensure that other mothers don't have to suffer the same horrible ordeal that her family has.

We can't get Katie back, or the other lives that have been lost to these senseless crimes, but we can do something to help solve cases and prevent similar crimes from occurring in the future. One such step is to enhance the capacity of States to collect the DNA of individuals arrested for certain felony crimes, which would substantially increase the ability of law enforcement to match DNA found at crimes scenes with that of suspects and individuals who have been previously arrested, charged, or convicted of crimes.

The Federal Government and about half the states, including New Mexico, currently collect arrestee DNA for serious offenses. This has proven to be a very effective tool in solving cases, and it makes sense to incentivize States to continue and to expand this effort. Since New Mexico implemented ''Katie's Law'' in 7007, there have been about 100 matches of arrestees. It is also important to note that DNA collection has not only demonstrated its effectiveness in terms of saving lives and preventing crimes, but it has also proved to be an important means of ensuring that innocent individuals are not mistakenly jailed for crimes they did not commit.

Let me take a moment to specifically describe what this legislation would, and would not, do. First, this legislation is aimed at creating an incentive for states to enact arrestee DNA collection program's. It is not a mandate. States that meet minimum collection guidelines could apply for DOJ grant assistance in covering the first-year costs that they have incurred or will incur in implementing the standards. If they enact laws in accordance with the enhanced guidelines, States would be eligible for an additional bonus payment.

Second, the bill encourages DNA testing for serious felonies, such as murder, sex crimes, aggravated assault, and burglary. It is narrowly tailored to apply to the most serious crimes. Third, the legislation provides that all of the expungement provisions under Federal law are applicable. Arrestees who have their DNA included in the Federal database may have their records expunged if their conviction is overturned, they are acquitted, or charges are dismissed or not filed within the applicable time period. Furthermore, the bill provides that as a condition of receiving a grant States must notify individuals who submit samples of the relevant expungement procedures and post the information on a public Web site.

Lastly, I would like to address the concerns some have raised about the constitutionality of collecting arrestee DNA. Although courts have upheld the collection of arrestee DNA, I recognize that the question of whether the collection of a DNA sample from an arrestee is consistent with the Fourth Amendment isn't a completely settled question of law. Some courts have viewed the collection as something akin to fingerprinting and other courts have viewed it as a more intrusive search, such as the taking of a blood sample. However, the Department of Justice has stated that it believes that this legislation is constitutional and is supportive of encouraging states to pass DNA arrestee laws. I believe that such programs, with appropriate safeguards in place, have demonstrated that they can be a very effective mechanism to save lives, solve crimes, and prevent wrongful convictions.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. RISCH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 518. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an exclusion for assistance provided to participants in certain veterinary student loan repayment or forgiveness programs; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I rise today to reintroduce legislation with my friend, Senator MIKE CRAPO of Idaho, that will exempt Veterinary Medicine Loan Repayment Program, VMLRP, awards from federal income taxation. I drafted this bipartisan bill with the intention of increasing veterinary services in underserved shortage areas that lack adequate veterinary expertise.

The United States Department of Agriculture's, USDA, Veterinary Medicine Loan Repayment Program was authorized in 2003 by the National Veterinary Medical Services Act, NVMSA, to help qualified veterinarians offset a significant amount of the debt they accrue while pursuing their degrees if they in turn serve in high-priority veterinary shortage areas for a certain length of time. However, the awards are currently taxed at a rate of 39 percent. This taxation is counterproductive and only delays delivery of veterinary services to areas that are in desperate need.

In determining whether an area is eligible for assistance under the VMLRP, USDA has the ability to declare ''shortage situations,'' in which the Department makes declarations of veterinary shortage areas. Currently, there are two circumstances that lead to such designations. The first is by geography, when a given geographic area suffers a shortage of veterinarians overall. The second occurs when areas suffer a shortage of veterinarians who practice in a particular field of veterinary specialty. My home State of South Dakota currently has four designated shortage situations. Two of these designations are statewide designations noting a shortage of practitioners in veterinary specialties. On a national scale, there are 1,300 counties in the United States that have less than one food animal veterinarian per 25,000 farm animals. Additionally, there are 500 counties that have at least 5,000 farm animals and not a single veterinarian. Bear in mind, the demand for veterinarians across our country could increase 14 percent by 2016.

South Dakota is truly a wonderful place to call home, but it is not always an easy place to earn a living. This is especially true for young people who are just starting out and are saddled with crushing levels of school debt. I have long fought for legislation that makes it easier for students to pay off their loans and to encourage others who may be reluctant to pursue higher education degrees, due to a lack of financial resources, especially when it comes to costly professional degrees including veterinary medicine. My legislation will help students pursue their educational goals, while also providing important services to underserved rural areas by enhancing the assistance veterinary graduates receive in exchange for meaningful public service.

Agriculture is the top contributor to our South Dakota economy. For those farmers and ranchers who make their living in agriculture, this is more than a job; it is a way of life. Our ranchers, many of whom operate in very rural areas, rely on the access they have to qualified veterinarians to care for their livestock. Adequate access to veterinary care in rural areas is critical for both human and animal health, as well as animal welfare, disease surveillance, public safety and economic development across America. Everyone in America benefits from the veterinary services provided in even the most remote areas of our nation. As such, I am committed to doing all I can to help bring veterinarians to underserved parts of our state.

I am proud to have fought for the establishment of the VMLRP program, and through my seat on the Senate Appropriations Committee, I have worked year after year to secure its proper funding. Unfortunately, however, the taxes assessed on these benefits prevent us from using congressionally appropriated funding to the fullest extent. For every three veterinarians selected for the loan repayment awards, an additional veterinarian could also be selected to serve in an underserved shortage area if the program was made exempt from taxes. Such a tax exemption is not without precedent; Congress exempted from taxation the assistance received by participants in the National Health Services Corps, NHSC, in 2004, and I hope that my colleagues will join me in extending this same type of assistance to veterinarians participating in the VMLRP program.

It should be noted that nearly 140 organizations from across the nation have announced their support for a tax exemption for VMLRP, including the American Veterinary Medical Association, American Association of Equine Practitioners, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the American Sheep Industry Association, the National Farmers Union, and the South Dakota Veterinary Medical Association, South Dakota Farm Bureau, South Dakota Farmers Union, South Dakota Cattlemen's Association, South Dakota Stockgrowers Association and many, many others.

Agriculture is the economic engine that drives our rural communities, and without viable family farms and ranchers, our small towns and Main Street businesses throughout South Dakota and our nation would face significant hardships. It is absolutely essential that our agricultural producers have access to the services they need to be successful and responsible, and the Veterinary Medicine Loan Repayment Program Enhancement Act will help make that possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter of support be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS DIVISION,

Washington, DC.

STATEMENT OF SUPPORT FOR THE VETERINARY MEDICINE LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAM ENHANCEMENT ACT

The undersigned organizations urge Congress to pass the Veterinary Medicine Loan Repayment Program Enhancement Act, which will provide a federal income tax exemption for payments received under the Veterinary Medicine Loan Repayment Program (VMLRP) and similar state programs.

Since Congress passed the ''National Veterinary Medical Services Act'' (PL 108–161) on Dec. 6, 2003, it has appropriated $9.6 million for awards. About $3.75 million of this amount will be used by the Agriculture Secretary to pay taxes on the awards. Every dollar spent on taxes is one less available for loan repayment awards. If awards are made tax exempt, one additional veterinarian can be selected for every three awarded under current law.

The first 62 veterinarians were selected for VMLRP awards in September 2010. These veterinarians will practice food supply medicine and veterinary public health in federally designated shortage situations across the country. The selected group of veterinarians will receive up to $25,000 annually for three years to repay student loans. Each VMLRP award including taxes for three years costs approximately $104,250 per veterinarian ($75,000 for loan repayment and $29,250 for taxes).

Congress set a precedent for tax exemption. The National Health Service Corps (NHSC) loan repayment program (counterpart program for human medicine) was exempted by ''The American Jobs Creation Act of 2004'' (H.R. 4520, P.L. 108–357), enacted on Oct. 22, 2004. Prior to this legislative change, NHSC loan repayment awards were treated as taxable income.

Veterinarians selected for VMLRP provide a wide array of necessary veterinary services for farmers' and ranchers' livestock including beef and dairy cows, poultry, swine, goats, sheep, and farm horses. VMLRP veterinarians ensure animal health and welfare while protecting the nation's food supply. They provide veterinarian-accredited medical procedures including routine services (vaccination, castration and dehorning) and emergency services (for acute illness, trauma, dystocia or obstetrical difficulties). Other services performed include those required for interstate movement of livestock, including commuter agreements and animal health testing requirements needed to ship livestock. VMLRP veterinarians perform tuberculosis checks and accredited blood sample services for Brucellosis, Bluetongue, and Bovine Viral Diarrhea. Additionally, they may provide reproduction management consultation services and consultation in health care programs and nutrition, disease surveillance and diagnostics for state and federal disease programs and foreign animal diseases. They may also play a role in a state's

veterinary emergency response team and take part in disease control and eradication programs.

Exempting veterinary medicine loan repayment and forgiveness program awards from federal income taxation will lead to more communities having needed veterinary services sooner than they may otherwise. We strongly support Congress' efforts to ensure that our nation's livestock are healthy, that our food supply is safe and secure, and our public health is protected.

Sincerely,

American Veterinary Medical Association, Academy of Rural Veterinarians, Alabama Veterinary Medical Association, Alaska Veterinary Medical Association, American Animal Hospital Association, American Academy of Veterinary Nutrition, American Association for Laboratory Animal Science, American Association of Avian Pathologists, American Association of Bovine Practitioners, American Association of Corporate and Public Practice Veterinarians, American Association of Equine Practitioners, American Association of Feline Practitioners, American Association of Food Hygiene Veterinarians, American Association of Public Health Veterinarians, American Association of Small Ruminant Practitioners.

American Association of Swine Veterinarians, American Association of Veterinary Clinicians, American Association of Veterinary Laboratory Diagnosticians, American Association of Zoo Veterinarians, American Board of Veterinary Practitioners, American Board of Veterinary Toxicology, American College of Laboratory Animal Medicine, American College of Poultry Veterinarians, American College of Theriogenologists, American College of Veterinary Dermatology, American College of Veterinary Pathologists, American College of Veterinary Radiology, American Dairy Science Association, American Farm Bureau Federation,® American Feed Industry Association.

American Horse Council, American Meat Institute, American Rabbit Breeders Association, Inc., American Sheep Industry Association, American Society of Animal Science, American Society of Laboratory Animal Practitioners, American Veal Association, American Veterinary Medical Foundation, Animal Agriculture Alliance's, Animal Health Institute, Animal Welfare Institute, Arizona Veterinary Medical Association, Arkansas Veterinary Medical Association, Association for Women Veterinarians Foundation, Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges.

Association of Avian Veterinarians, Association of Veterinary Biologics Companies, Association of Zoos & Aquariums, Bayer Animal Health, Boehringer Ingelheim Vetmedica, Inc., California Veterinary Medical Association, Center for Rural Affairs, Colorado Veterinary Medical Association, Connecticut Veterinary Medical Association, Delaware Veterinary Medical Association, District of Columbia Veterinary Medical Association, Elanco Animal Health (A Division of Eli Lilly & Company), Federation for Animal Science Societies, Florida Veterinary Medical Association, Georgia Veterinary Medical Association.

Hawaii Veterinary Medical Association, Idaho Veterinary Medical Association, Illinois State Veterinary Medical Association, Indiana Veterinary Medical Association, International Lama Registry, Iowa Veterinary Medical Association, Kansas Bioscience Authority, Kansas City Animal Health Corridor, Kansas Veterinary Medical Association, Kentucky Veterinary Medical Association, Livestock Marketing Association, Louisiana Veterinary Medical Association, Maine Veterinary Medical Association, Maryland Veterinary Medical Association, Inc., Massachusetts Veterinary Medical Association.

Michigan Veterinary Medical Association, Minnesota Veterinary Medical Association, Mississippi Veterinary Medical Association, Missouri Veterinary Medical Association, Montana Veterinary Medical Association, National Aquaculture Association, National Association of Federal Veterinarians, National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, National Association of State Public Health Veterinarians, National Chicken Council, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Dairy Herd Information Association, National Farmers Union, National Institute for Animal Agriculture, National Livestock Producers Association.

National Milk Producers Federation, National Pork Producers Council, National Renderers Association, National Turkey Federation, Nebraska Veterinary Medical Association, Nevada Veterinary Medical Association, New Hampshire Veterinary Medical Association, New Jersey Veterinary Medical Association, New York State Veterinary Medical Society, North American Deer Farmers Association, North Carolina Veterinary Medical Association, North Dakota Veterinary Medical Association, Northeast States Association for Agriculture Stewardship, Ohio Veterinary Medical Association, Oklahoma Veterinary Medical Association.

Oregon Veterinary Medical Association, Pet Food Institute, Pfizer Animal Health, Puerto Rico Veterinary Medical Association (Colegio de Medicos Veterinarios de Puerto Rico), Pennsylvania Veterinary Medical Association, Poultry Science Association, Rhode Island Veterinary Medical Association, Rocky Mountain Farmers Union, Silliker, Inc., Society for Theriogenology, South Carolina Association of Veterinarians, South Dakota Cattlemen's Association, South Dakota Farmers Union, South Dakota Pork Producers Council, South Dakota Stockgrowers Association.

South Dakota Veterinary Medical Association, South Dakota Farm Bureau, State Agriculture and Rural Leaders, Student American Veterinary Medical Association, Synbiotics Corporation, Tennessee Veterinary Medical Association, Texas Veterinary Medical Association, United Egg Producers, United States Animal Health Association, U.S. Cattlemen's Association, Utah Veterinary Medical Association, Vermont Veterinary Medical Association, Virginia Veterinary Medical Association, Washington State Veterinary Medical Association, Wisconsin Veterinary Medical Association, Wyoming Veterinary Medical Association.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. ENSIGN, Mrs. BOXER, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 519. A bill to further allocate and expand the availability of hydroelectric power generated at Hoover Dam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 519

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Hoover Power Allocation Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. ALLOCATION OF CONTRACTS FOR POWER.

(a) SCHEDULE A POWER.—Section 105(a)(1)(A) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a(a)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''renewal'';

(2) by striking ''June 1, 1987'' and inserting ''October 1, 2017''; and

(3) by striking Schedule A and inserting the following:

''Schedule A

Long-term Schedule A contingent capacity and associated firm energy for offers of contracts to Boulder Canyon project contractors

Contractor	Contingent capacity (kW)	Firm energy (thousands of kWh)		
		Summer	Winter	Total
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	249,948	859,163	368,212	1,227,375
City of Los Angeles	495,732	464,108	199,175	663,283
Southern California Edison Company	280,245	166,712	71,448	238,160
City of Glendale	18,178	45,028	19,297	64,325
City of Pasadena	11,108	38,622	16,553	55,175
City of Burbank	5,176	14,070	6,030	20,100
Arizona Power Authority	190,869	429,582	184,107	613,689
Colorado River Commission of Nevada	190,869	429,582	184,107	613,689
United States, for Boulder City	20,198	53,200	22,800	76,000
Totals	1,462,323	2,500,067	1,071,729	3,571,796''.

(b) SCHEDULE B POWER.—Section 105(a)(1)(B) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a(a)(1)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

''(B) To each existing contractor for power generated at Hoover Dam, a contract, for delivery commencing October 1, 2017, of the amount of contingent capacity and firm energy specified for that contractor in the following table:

"Schedule B

Long-term Schedule B contingent capacity and associated firm energy for offers of contracts to Boulder Canyon project contractors

Contractor	Contingent capacity (kW)	Firm energy (thousands of kWh)		
		Summer	Winter	Total
City of Glendale	2,020	2,749	1,194	3,943
City of Pasadena	9,089	2,399	1,041	3,440
City of Burbank	15,149	3,604	1,566	5,170
City of Anaheim	40,396	34,442	14,958	49,400
City of Azusa	4,039	3,312	1,438	4,750
City of Banning	2,020	1,324	576	1,900
City of Colton	3,030	2,650	1,150	3,800
City of Riverside	30,296	25,831	11,219	37,050
City of Vernon	22,218	18,546	8,054	26,600
Arizona	189,860	140,600	60,800	201,400
Nevada	189,860	273,600	117,800	391,400
Totals	507,977	509,057	219,796	728,853".

(c) SCHEDULE C POWER.—Section 105(a)(1)(C) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a(a)(1)(C)) is amended—

(1) by striking "June 1, 1987" and inserting "October 1, 2017"; and

(2) by striking Schedule C and inserting the following:

"Schedule C

Excess Energy

Priority of entitlement to excess energy	State
First: Meeting Arizona's first priority right to delivery of excess energy which is equal in each year of operation to 200 million kilowatthours: Provided, That in the event excess energy in the amount of 200 million kilowatthours is not generated during any year of operation, Arizona shall accumulate a first right to delivery of excess energy subsequently generated in an amount not to exceed 600 million kilowatthours, inclusive of the current year's 200 million kilowatthours. Said first right of delivery shall accrue at a rate of 200 million kilowatthours per year for each year excess energy in an amount of 200 million kilowatthours is not generated, less amounts of excess energy delivered.	Arizona
Second: Meeting Hoover Dam contractual obligations under Schedule A of subsection (a)(1)(A), under Schedule B of subsection (a)(1)(B), and under Schedule D of subsection (a)(2), not exceeding 26 million kilowatthours in each year of operation.	Arizona, Nevada, and California
Third: Meeting the energy requirements of the three States, such available excess energy to be divided equally among the States.	Arizona, Nevada, and California".

(d) SCHEDULE D POWER.—Section 105(a) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(2)(A) The Secretary of Energy is authorized to and shall create from the apportioned allocation of contingent capacity and firm energy adjusted from the amounts authorized in this Act in 1984 to the amounts shown in Schedule A and Schedule B, as modified by the Hoover Power Allocation Act of 2011, a resource pool equal to 5 percent of the full rated capacity of 2,074,000 kilowatts, and associated firm energy, as shown in Schedule D (referred to in this section as 'Schedule D contingent capacity and firm energy'):

"Schedule D

Long-term Schedule D resource pool of contingent capacity and associated firm energy for new allottees

State	Contingent capacity (kW)	Firm energy (thousands of kWh)		
		Summer	Winter	Total
New Entities Allocated by the Secretary of Energy	69,170	105,637	45,376	151,013
New Entities Allocated by State				
Arizona	11,510	17,580	7,533	25,113
California	11,510	17,580	7,533	25,113
Nevada	11,510	17,580	7,533	25,113
Totals	103,700	158,377	67,975	226,352

"(B) The Secretary of Energy shall offer Schedule D contingency capacity and firm energy to entities not receiving contingent capacity and firm energy under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) (referred to in this section as 'new allottees') for delivery commencing October 1, 2017 pursuant to this subsection. In this subsection, the term 'the marketing area for the Boulder City Area Projects' shall have the same meaning as in appendix A of the General Consolidated Power Marketing Criteria or Regulations for Boulder City Area Projects published in the Federal Register on December 28, 1984 (49 Federal Register 50582 et seq.) (referred to in this section as the 'Criteria').

"(C)(i) Within 36 months of the date of enactment of the Hoover Power Allocation Act of 2011, the Secretary of Energy shall allocate through the Western Area Power Administration (referred to in this section as 'Western'), for delivery commencing October 1, 2017, for use in the marketing area for the Boulder City Area Projects 66.7 percent of the Schedule D contingent capacity and firm energy to new allottees that are located within the marketing area for the Boulder City Area Projects and that are—

"(I) eligible to enter into contracts under section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (43 U.S.C. 617d); or

"(II) federally recognized Indian tribes.

"(ii) In the case of Arizona and Nevada, Schedule D contingent capacity and firm energy for new allottees other than federally recognized Indian tribes shall be offered through the Arizona Power Authority and the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, respectively. Schedule D contingent capacity and firm energy allocated to federally recognized Indian tribes shall be contracted for directly with Western.

''(D) Within 1 year of the date of enactment of the Hoover Power Allocation Act of 2011, the Secretary of Energy also shall allocate, for delivery commencing October 1, 2017, for use in the marketing area for the Boulder City Area Projects 11.1 percent of the Schedule D contingent capacity and firm energy to each of—

''(i) the Arizona Power Authority for allocation to new allottees in the State of Arizona;

''(ii) the Colorado River Commission of Nevada for allocation to new allottees in the State of Nevada; and

''(iii) Western for allocation to new allottees within the State of California, provided that Western shall have 36 months to complete such allocation.

''(E) Each contract offered pursuant to this subsection shall include a provision requiring the new allottee to pay a proportionate share of its State's respective contribution (determined in accordance with each State's applicable funding agreement) to the cost of the Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program (as defined in section 9401 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–11; 123 Stat. 1327)), and to execute the Boulder Canyon Project Implementation Agreement Contract No. 95–PAO–10616 (referred to in this section as the 'Implementation Agreement').

''(F) Any of the 66.7 percent of Schedule D contingent capacity and firm energy that is to be allocated by Western that is not allocated and placed under contract by October 1, 2017, shall be returned to those contractors shown in Schedule A and Schedule B in the same proportion as those contractors' allocations of Schedule A and Schedule B contingent capacity and firm energy. Any of the 33.3 percent of Schedule D contingent capacity and firm energy that is to be distributed within the States of Arizona, Nevada, and California that is not allocated and placed under contract by October 1, 2017, shall be returned to the Schedule A and Schedule B contractors within the State in which the Schedule D contingent capacity and firm energy were to be distributed, in the same proportion as those contractors' allocations of Schedule A and Schedule B contingent capacity and firm energy.''.

(e) TOTAL OBLIGATIONS.—Paragraph (3) of section 105(a) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a(a)) (as redesignated as subsection (d)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''schedule A of section 105(a)(1)(A) and schedule B of section 105(a)(1)(B)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (1)(A), (1)(B), and (2)''; and

(2) in the second sentence—

(A) by striking ''any'' and inserting ''each'';

(B) by striking ''schedule C'' and inserting ''Schedule C''; and

(C) by striking ''schedules A and B'' and inserting ''Schedules A, B, and D''.

(f) POWER MARKETING CRITERIA.—Paragraph (4) of section 105(a) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a(a)) (as redesignated as subsection (d)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) Subdivision E of the Criteria shall be deemed to have been modified to conform to this section, as modified by the Hoover Power Allocation Act of 2011. The Secretary of Energy shall cause to be included in the Federal Register a notice conforming the text of the regulations to such modifications.''.

(g) CONTRACT TERMS.—Paragraph (5) of section 105(a) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a(a)) (as redesignated as subsection (d)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) in accordance with section 5(a) of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (43 U.S.C. 617d(a)), expire September 30, 2067;'';

(2) in the proviso of subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking ''shall use'' and inserting ''shall allocate''; and

(B) by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end;

(3) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) authorize and require Western to collect from new allottees a pro rata share of Hoover Dam repayable advances paid for by contractors prior to October 1, 2017, and remit such amounts to the contractors that paid such advances in proportion to the amounts paid by such contractors as specified in section 6.4 of the Implementation Agreement;

''(E) permit transactions with an independent system operator; and

''(F) contain the same material terms included in section 5.6 of those long-term contracts for purchases from the Hoover Power Plant that were made in accordance with this Act and are in existence on the date of enactment of the Hoover Power Allocation Act of 2011.''.

(h) EXISTING RIGHTS.—Section 105(b) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a(b)) is amended by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2067''.

(i) OFFERS.—Section 105(c) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a(c)) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) OFFER OF CONTRACT TO OTHER ENTITIES.—If any existing contractor fails to accept an offered contract, the Secretary of Energy shall offer the contingent capacity and firm energy thus available first to other entities in the same State listed in Schedule A and Schedule B, second to other entities listed in Schedule A and Schedule B, third to other entities in the same State which receive contingent capacity and firm energy under subsection (a)(2) of this section, and last to other entities which receive contingent capacity and firm energy under subsection (a)(2) of this section.''.

(j) AVAILABILITY OF WATER.—Section 105(d) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a(d)) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) WATER AVAILABILITY.—Except with respect to energy purchased at the request of an allottee pursuant to subsection (a)(3), the obligation of the Secretary of Energy to deliver contingent capacity and firm energy pursuant to contracts entered into pursuant to this section shall be subject to availability of the water needed to produce such contingent capacity and firm energy. In the event that water is not available to produce the contingent capacity and firm energy set forth in Schedule A, Schedule B, and Schedule D, the Secretary of Energy shall adjust the contingent capacity and firm energy offered under those Schedules in the same proportion as those contractors' allocations of Schedule A, Schedule B, and Schedule D contingent capacity and firm energy bears to the full rated contingent capacity and firm energy obligations.''.

(k) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 105 of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (e) and (f); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (g), (h), and (i) as subsections (e), (f), and (g), respectively.

(l) CONTINUED CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT.—Subsection (e) of section 105 of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a)) (as redesignated by subsection (k)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''the renewal of''; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking ''June 1, 1987, and ending September 30, 2017'' and inserting ''October 1, 2017, and ending September 30, 2067''.

(m) COURT CHALLENGES.—Subsection (f)(1) of section 105 of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a) (as redesignated by subsection (k)(2)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''this Act'' and inserting ''the Hoover Power Allocation Act of 2011''.

(n) REAFFIRMATION OF CONGRESSIONAL DECLARATION OF PURPOSE.—Subsection (g) of section 105 of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a) (as redesignated by subsection (k)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''subsections (c), (g), and (h) of this section'' and inserting ''this Act''; and

(2) by striking ''June 1, 1987, and ending September 30, 2017'' and inserting ''October 1, 2017, and ending September 30, 2067''.

SEC. 3. PAYGO.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 524. A bill to terminate certain hydropower reservations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to remove the encumbrances from land patents for a dam project that will never be built. This will enable the current owner of the land to sell or bequeath his land more easily.

Donald Smith and his family acquired two parcels of undeveloped public land in Madera County, California by patent of the United States in 1983 and 1987. These parcels, comprising 103.26 acres and 41.323 acres, respectively, are adjacent to U.S. Forest Service land.

In the early 1980s, the U.S. Government anticipated that a hydroelectric power project might someday be built in the vicinity, causing all or a portion of these lands to be inundated with water. Accordingly, when it issued the 1983 patent to Mr. Smith, the Bureau of Land Management included a ''flowage easement'', reserving the right of the government to flood the lands for a power dam. In the mid-1980s, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission determined that this reservation and others like it were ''non-essential'', and that no dam would be built. Accordingly, no easement was included in the 1987 patent, although some believe it was erroneously omitted.

Flowage easements constitute a cloud on the title to land, restricting its market value and the orderly disposition of his estate. Since FERC, and all potentially interested parties, including BLM, Southern California Edison and the U.S. Forest Service, have agreed that the easement in this instance serves no purpose, and no dam

will be built, clear title should be restored. The Solicitor of the Department of the Interior has decided this requires an Act of Congress.

Mr. Smith is now a senior citizen, and seeks to assure that his heirs will not be burdened by this matter and will benefit from the full fair market value of these now-verdant and recreational lands. Through enactment of this simple bill, the Congress will finally affirm a decision made by FERC in 1986, and restore ''clean'' title for benefit of Mr. Smith, his heirs and assigns.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 524

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

SECTION 1. TERMINATION OF HYDROPOWER RESERVATIONS.

(a) TERMINATION OF RESERVATION RELATING TO BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT PATENT NUMBERED CA 6313.—The reservation under section 24 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 818) of the Bureau of Land Management patent numbered CA 6313 and dated May 13, 1983, to the approximately 103.26 acres of land now owned by Donald L. Smith in Madera County, California, and more particularly described as a portion of secs. 25, 26, 35, and 36, T. 4 S., R. 24 E., Mount Diablo Meridian, is terminated.

(b) TERMINATION OF RESERVATION RELATING TO BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT PATENT NUMBERED CA 19394.—To the extent that any reservation of use for hydropower could be determined to have been omitted under section 24 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 818) from the Bureau of Land Management patent numbered CA 19394 and dated September 25, 1987, to the approximately 41.323 acres of land conveyed to Lindsay Smith, Peggy L. Birchim, Donald L. Smith, and Keith Smith, and more particularly described as comprising a portion of secs. 25 and 36, unsurveyed T. 4 S., R. 24 E., Mount Diablo Meridian, Jackass Mining District, Madera County, California, the reservation is terminated.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 525. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for integration of mental health services and mental health treatment outreach teams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague from Maryland, Senator MIKULSKI, in introducing the Positive Aging Act, which will help to increase older Americans' access to quality mental health screening and treatment services in community-based care settings.

The legislation we are introducing today is particularly important for States like Maine that have a disproportionate number of older persons. Fifteen percent of Maine's population is 65 or older, and, with the highest median age, Maine is the ''oldest'' State in the nation. Moreover, our percentage of older adults is increasing, and, by 2030, more than one in five Mainers will be over the age of 65.

One of the most daunting public health challenges facing our Nation today is how to increase access to quality mental health services for the more than 44 million Americans with severe, disabling mental disorders that can devastate their lives and the lives of the people around them.

What is often overlooked, however, is the prevalence of mental illness among our Nation's elderly. Studies have shown that more than one in five Americans aged 65 and older experience mental illness, and that as many as 80 percent of elderly persons in nursing homes suffer from some kind of mental impairment. Particularly disturbing is the fact that the mental health needs of older Americans are often overlooked or not recognized because of the mistaken belief that they are a normal part of aging and therefore cannot be treated.

While older Americans experience the full range of mental disorders, the most prevalent mental illness afflicting older people is depression. Ironically, while recent advances have made depression an eminently treatable disorder, only a minority of elderly depressed persons are receiving adequate treatment. Unfortunately, the vast majority of depressed elderly don't seek help. Many simply accept their feelings of profound sadness and do not realize that they are clinically depressed.

Moreover, those who do seek help are often underdiagnosed or misdiagnosed, leading the National Institute of Mental Health to estimate that 60 percent of older Americans with depression are not receiving the mental health care that they need. Failure to treat this kind of disorder leads to poorer health outcomes for other medical conditions, higher rates of institutionalization, and increased health care costs.

Fortunately, important research is being done that is developing innovative approaches to improve the delivery of mental health care for older adults by integrating it into primary care settings. This research demonstrates that older adults are more likely to receive appropriate mental health care if there is a mental health professional on the primary care team, rather than simply referring them to a mental health specialist outside the primary care setting. Multiple appointments with multiple providers in multiple settings simply don't work for older patients who must also cope with concurrent chronic illnesses, mobility problems, and limited transportation options. The research also shows that there is less stigma associated with psychiatric services when they are integrated into general medical care.

The Positive Aging Act builds upon this research and authorizes funding for projects that integrate mental health screening and treatment services into community sites and primary care settings. Specifically, the Positive Aging Act of 2011 would authorize the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration to fund demonstration projects to support integration of mental health services in primary care settings. It would also support grants for community-based mental health treatment outreach teams to improve older Americans' access to mental health services. To ensure that these geriatric mental health programs have proper attention and oversight, it would mandate the designation of a Deputy Director for Older Adult Mental Health Services in the Center for Mental Health Services, and it would also include representatives of older Americans or their families and geriatric mental health professionals on the Advisory Council for the Center for Mental Health Services. Finally, it would require state plans under Community Mental Health Services Block Grants to include descriptions of the states' outreach to and services for older individuals.

We are fortunate today to have a variety of effective treatments to address the mental health needs of American seniors. The Positive Aging Act will help to ensure that older Americans have access to these important services. I therefore urge my colleagues to sign on as cosponsors of the legislation, which has been endorsed by a broad coalition of mental health and senior organizations, including the Alzheimer's Association, the American Geriatrics Society, the American Psychiatric Association, the American Psychological Association, the American Association for Geriatric Psychiatry, and the National Council on Aging.

Mr. President, I ask uanimous consent that a letter of support be printed in the RECORD.

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

MARCH 7, 2011.

Hon. SUSAN M. COLLINS,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS COLLINS AND MIKULSKI: On behalf of the undersigned organizations, we are writing to applaud your ongoing commitment to the mental and behavioral health needs of older Americans and express our strong support for the Positive Aging Act, which you are planning to introduce in the near future. This important legislation will improve access to vital mental and behavioral health care for older adults by supporting the integration of mental health services in primary care and community settings.

An estimated 20 percent of community-based older adults in the U.S. have a mental health problem. These disorders can have a significant impact on both physical and mental health, often leading to increases in disease, disability, and mortality. In fact, men age 85 and older currently have the highest rates of suicide in our country and depression is the foremost risk factor. Evidence suggests that up to 75 percent of older adults who die by suicide have visited a primary

care professional within 30 days of their death. Although effective treatments exist, the mental health needs of many older Americans go unrecognized and untreated because of poorly integrated systems of care to address the physical and mental health needs of seniors.

The Positive Aging Act takes an important step toward improving access to quality mental and behavioral health care for older adults by integrating mental health services in primary care and community settings where older adults reside and receive services. By supporting collaboration between interdisciplinary teams of mental health professionals and other providers of health and social services, this legislation promotes an integrated approach to addressing the health and well being of our nation's growing older adult population.

We commend you for your leadership and commitment to the mental and behavioral health needs of older adults and look forward to working with you to ensure passage of the Positive Aging Act.

Sincerely,

Alzheimer's Association; Alzheimer's Foundation of America; American Assisted Living Nurses Association; American Association for Geriatric Psychiatry; American Association for Long Term Care Nursing; American Association for Psychoanalysis in Clinical Social Work; American Association for Psychosocial Rehabilitation; American Association on Health and Disability; American Foundation for Suicide Prevention/SPAN USA; American Geriatrics Society; American Group Psychotherapy Association; American Mental Health Counselors Association; American Nurses Association; American Occupational Therapy Association; American Orthopsychiatric Association; American Psychiatric Association; American Psychological Association; American Psychotherapy Association; American Society on Aging; Anxiety Disorders Association of America.

Association for Ambulatory Behavioral Healthcare; Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law; Clinical Social Work Association; Clinical Social Work Guild 49; Council of Professional Geropsychology Training Programs; Depression and Bipolar Support Alliance; Direct Care Alliance; Geriatric Mental Health Alliance of New York; Gerontological Society of America; Illinois Coalition on Mental Health and Aging; Iowa Coalition on Mental Health and Aging; Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago; Jewish Federations of North America; Kansas Advocates for Better Care; Kansas Suicide Prevention Committee; Mental Health America; Midland Area Agency on Aging; National Alliance for Caregiving; National Association for Behavioral Health; National Association for Children's Behavioral Health.

National Association of Area Agencies on Aging; National Association of Social Workers; National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors; National Center for Assisted Living; National Coalition on Care Coordination; National Consumer Voice for Quality Long-Term Care; National Council for Community Behavioral Healthcare; National Council on Aging; National Council on Problem Gambling; National Foundation for Mental Health; New Hampshire Coalition on Substance Abuse, Mental Health & Aging; Oklahoma Mental Health and Aging Coalition; PHI—Quality Care through Quality Jobs; Psychologists in Long Term Care; US Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association; Witness Justice.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 532. A bill to establish the Patriot Express Loan Program under which the Small Business Administration may make loans to members of the military community wanting to start or expand small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to join with my friend and colleague, Senator MARK PRYOR, in introducing the Patriot Express Authorization Act of 2011. This legislation codifies a critical Small Business Administration, SBA, lending program for America's veterans and Reservists, as well as their spouses.

It is critical that we support our nation's veterans and, in particular, our service-members returning from Afghanistan and Iraq. Regrettably, the unemployment rate for veterans of these two wars is 12.5 percent—a full 3.6 percent higher than the national unemployment rate for the overall population. Many of these brave men and women have aspirations of owning their own business, and I was proud to work with Senator KERRY to pass the Military Reservist and Veteran Small Business Reauthorization and Opportunity Act of 2008, which President George W. Bush signed into law three years ago. This legislation contains a number of provisions to help veterans and Reservists who own or are seeking to own a business, and created an Interagency Task Force on Veterans Small Business Development, which President Obama formed by Executive Order last spring, to assist veterans with government contracting and capital access opportunities in particular.

One way the SBA has supported veteran entrepreneurs is through the Patriot Express Loan Initiative, which was established as a pilot program in 2007. According to the data from the SBA, Patriot Express supported nearly 7,000 loans totaling $560 million to small businesses owned and operated by eligible participants in just three and a half years. While the program was scheduled to expire in December, the SBA extended it for an additional three years, through 2013. That said, this legislation would provide certainty to the program by placing it in statute.

Coupled with the counseling and training assistance provided by the SBA's Office of Veterans Business Development, the Patriot Express loan program is a signal to our nation's veterans, Reservists, service-members, and their families that the Federal government takes seriously its obligation to give back for all they have done to defend our nation. These loans will help participants start or expand their firms, purchase equipment or inventory, and ultimately, create jobs. I am proud to cosponsor this legislation with Senator PRYOR.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. 533. A bill to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce important civil justice legislation. This legislation is desperately needed for several reasons—the most important of which is to cut down on the costs and expenses that are preventing private businesses from creating jobs for our fellow citizens during these difficult times.

The billions of dollars wasted on frivolous lawsuits cost Americans jobs and severely damage our economy. The precise cost of America's lawsuit culture is staggering. The tort system's direct costs in 2002 were $233 billion, the equivalent of a 5 percent tax on wages. Today that number is even higher; the annual direct cost of American tort litigation exceeds $250 billion.

Indeed, frivolous lawsuits are helping to prevent the ''innovation'' that the Obama administration is touting as the key to ''job creation'' and economic recovery. For example, firms with recent initial public offerings are most at risk to be sued. In fact, companies are most likely to be sued in their second year of public trading. In other words, the very corporations most likely to be the source of significant new job creation are at the highest risk of being sued just when they are seeking expansion capital through public offerings.

In particular, frivolous lawsuits hurt small businesses. Small businesses rank the cost and availability of liability insurance as second only to the cost of health care as their top concerns, and both problems are fueled by frivolous lawsuits.

Our front-line defense against frivolous lawsuits and the misuse of our legal system is Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. This rule is intended to deter frivolous lawsuits by sanctioning the offending party. The power of Rule 11 was diluted in 1993. This weakening is unacceptable to those of us who want to preserve courts as neutral forums for dispute resolution.

That is why I am introducing the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2011, ''LARA,'' which amends Rule 11 to restore its strength and ability to truly deter frivolous lawsuits. Senator MIKE LEE of Utah is cosponsoring this bill.

Representative LAMAR SMITH, the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, is introducing an identical bill today in the House of Representatives.

Specifically, LARA takes three strong steps to help thwart frivolous lawsuits.

First, LARA reverses the 1993 amendments to Rule 11 that made sanctions discretionary rather than mandatory.

One of the most harmful changes that took effect in 1993 was to make sanctions for proven violations of Rule 11 discretionary. This means that if a party files a lawsuit simply to harass another party, and the court decides that this is in fact the case, the offending party still might not be sanctioned. This is unacceptable. The offending

party might not be punished at all, which provides no deterrence for the offending party or anyone else who wants to misuse the courts. My bill reinstates the requirement that if there is a violation of Rule 11, there are sanctions.

Second, LARA requires that judges impose monetary sanctions against lawyers who file frivolous lawsuits. Those monetary sanctions will include the attorney's fees and costs incurred by the victim of the frivolous lawsuit.

Finally, LARA reverses the 1993 amendments to Rule 11 that allow parties and their attorneys to avoid sanctions for making frivolous claims by withdrawing them within 21 days after a motion for sanctions has been served.

Because of Rule 11's ''safe harbor'' provision, many frivolous claims are never fully reviewed by federal judges. Under the ''safe harbor'' provision, a person who is victimized by a frivolous claim must hire an attorney to draft a motion for sanctions. That motion cannot, however, be filed immediately. Rather, under Rule 11(c)(2), the motion is served on the offending attorney 21-days before it is filed. During that period, the offending attorney can withdraw the frivolous claim and thereby avoid any sanction. LARA would prevent such injustices by eliminating the ''safe harbor'' provision.

Although LARA would only amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the procedural rules in State courts are often amended to track changes in the Federal rules. Consequently, it is our hope that many states would amend their rules governing frivolous lawsuits to reflect the changes implemented by LARA, just as they did when Rule 11 was last changed in 1993.

Without the serious threat of punishment for filing frivolous lawsuits, innocent individuals and companies will continue to face the harsh economic reality that simply paying off frivolous claimants through monetary settlements is often cheaper than litigating the case. This perverse dynamic not only results in legalized extortion, but it leads to increases in the insurance premiums all individuals and businesses must pay. That is money that could be going to create new jobs.

I want to work with those who are willing to be reasonable. I know that some have expressed concerns with similar bills in the past. We have considered those concerns and have drafted a bill that takes them into account. For example, this bill expressly provides that nothing in it ''shall be construed to bar or impede the assertion or development of new claims, defenses, or remedies under Federal, State, or local laws, including civil rights laws.''

Requiring mandatory sanctions is not an extreme position. It is a reasonable and effective solution to the problem of runaway frivolous lawsuits.

Indeed, a mandatory sanctions requirement is currently the law in the area of securities litigation. In 1995, we enacted the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act, PSLRA, over President Clinton's veto. It essentially reinstates the 1983 version of Rule 11 for the purposes of securities litigation that falls within its coverage, and makes the imposition of sanctions mandatory. Upon a final adjudication of a case, the PSLRA requires courts to make written findings on whether the parties have complied with Rule 11. In other words, no motion for sanctions needs to be filed.

At the conclusion of the case, a judge must review the case for compliance with Rule 11 and, if he finds that there has been a violation, he must impose sanctions.

So addressing the damaging impact of frivolous lawsuits has had bipartisan support in the past. That bipartisan support should be even greater during these difficult economic times.

Let's look at a few examples of the type of lawsuits that businesses must contend with:

In July 2009, three New Jersey residents, backed by an advocacy group, filed a class action lawsuit against several hot dog manufacturers claiming they were exposed to carcinogens by eating hot dogs. None of the plaintiffs had actually developed cancer. The lawsuit sought damages in the amount of the total cost of the plaintiffs' hot dog purchases and a requirement that the companies place a new label on packages and advertising reading: ''Warning: Consuming hot dogs and other processed meats increases the risk of cancer.''

The case was dismissed on a Rule 12(b)(6) motion. Thus, a Federal court held that the plaintiffs had failed to even allege a claim, as a matter of law.

In another case, a customer alleged that a wild bird ''attacked'' her while in a Lowe's outdoor garden center, causing her head injuries. She claimed negligence and a violation of the Illinois Animal Control Act. She maintained that the wild birds created a dangerous condition on the property and that Lowe's failed to exercise ordinary care to ensure that the premises were reasonably safe and failed to prevent the birds from entering the garden center.

A Federal court entered summary judgment in favor of Lowe's holding that a ''reasonable plaintiff'' either would have noticed the birds or understood that contact with them was possible in any outdoor area with plants. The court also held that Lowe's was not the ''owner'' of the birds, a necessary element of the customer's statutory claim.

These are just two examples of the scores of frivolous lawsuits that American businesses must contend with each year.

Requiring sanctions when judges find lawsuits are frivolous will deter these types of cases from being brought. The savings will result in cost savings for businesses and new jobs for American workers.

The time for words and rhetoric has long since passed. If the President means what he is saying about creating jobs, then we must take action. We need to help private business spur job creation. LARA is action. LARA is a step in the right direction.

I urge all of my colleagues to work with me and to support this legislation.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BURR, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. TESTER, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 534. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain small producers; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, today Senator CRAPO and I are reintroducing legislation to assist small brewers across the country. The Brewer's Employment and Excise Relief, BEER, Act of 2011 would reduce the excise tax on domestic small beer producers as well as update the definition of what constitutes a small brewer to reflect today's market. Senators WYDEN, SNOWE, SCHUMER, CORNYN, LEAHY, BURR, MIKULSKI, SCOTT BROWN, MERKLEY, WICKER, SHERROD BROWN, CHAMBLISS, TESTER, COCHRAN, and CANTWELL are cosponsors of this legislation.

As our economy continues on a track to recovery, we should remain focused on reducing unemployment and putting American's back to work. This legislation will do just that by helping an industry that is hiring and plans on expanding. Massachusetts is home to 38 small breweries.

Though there has been a continued increase in consumer demand for the unique brews created by these small brewers, these beer producers operate at a distinct disadvantage when compared to the largest brewers in this country. While demand is growing, small brewers account for just 5 percent of beer sales nationwide and they face higher costs for production, raw materials, and market entry when compared to their much larger counterparts.

The BEER Act legislation will revise the classification of a domestic small brewer, a definition that has not been updated since 1976. Under current law, small brewers are limited to those that produce 2 million barrels of beer per year. This legislation would update and raise the ceiling for the small brewer tax rate to 6 million barrels per year to reflect the original intent of differentiation between the large and small brewers. The largest beer producer in America used to produce 45 million barrels annually and that has increased to over 100 million barrels.

This legislation will also lower the excise tax rate on these small brewers on their first 60,000 barrels produced from $7 per barrel to $3.50 per barrel. Currently for the production over 60,000 barrels up to 2 million barrels, these brewers pay $18 per barrel in taxes, the same amount that the large brewers pay. This legislation would reduce that rate for small brewers to $16 per barrel.

Small brewers employ nearly 100,000 people nationwide. This legislation will provide tax relief for this important industry, and allow these companies to expand both their production and their work force. A March 2010 economic analysis of this legislation done by Dr. John Friedman of Harvard University has estimated that the legislation will stimulate job creation at a rate of 2,700 new jobs in the first year to 18 months, with an additional 375 new jobs each year for the following 4 years.

The benefits do not simply begin and end with the ability for these small breweries to grow. This legislation would benefit the consumer buying a 6 pack of Sierra Nevada or Harpoon in their local supermarket where prices on craft beer would be reduced by about 20 cents per case. The farms in the states that produce the barely, hops, and other materials that go into these fine brews would also see an increased demand for their products.

This legislation would provide important benefits to America's small brewers and spur economic activity. It will provide relief and allow them to expand to meet the demands of a growing marketplace. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and support small, domestic beer producers.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 96—CONGRATULATING THE ARMY DENTAL CORPS ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 96

Whereas on March 3, 1911, Congress was the first to officially recognize dentistry as a distinct profession by establishing an Army Dental Service with commissioned officers, a seminal event for dentistry as well as for military history;

Whereas dental health is a critical component of military medical readiness;

Whereas throughout history, the Army Dental Corps has preserved the strength of the Army by minimizing risk for and expediting treatment of dental emergencies;

Whereas the Army Dental Corps works continuously to improve the oral health of soldiers and their families by supporting individual and community prevention initiatives, good oral hygiene practices, and evidence-based treatment;

Whereas the Army Dental Corps endeavors to improve oral health world-wide by participating in the full spectrum of military and peacekeeping operations, serving as dental ambassadors through care rendered to United States and coalition military personnel during combat operations, and local national citizens in humanitarian operations;

Whereas the Army Dental Corps, in collaboration with national and international dental organizations, promotes synergy among all dental professionals;

Whereas the Army Dental Corps supports the mission of the Federal dental research program, and endorses improved dental technologies and therapies through research and adherence to sound scientific principles; and

Whereas the Army Dental Corps recognizes the importance of lifelong pursuit of continuing dental education, and executes this mission through specialty dental education and postgraduate residencies and fellowships for its members: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Army Dental Corps on its 100th anniversary;

(2) commends the Army Dental Corps for its work to improve the dental readiness of the Army, and the oral health of soldiers and their families;

(3) recognizes the thousands of dentists who have served in the Army Dental Corps over the last 100 years, providing dental care to millions of members of the Armed Forces and their families; and

(4) commends the Army Dental Corps for its efforts to keep America's soldiers healthy and the best fighting force in the world.

SENATE RESOLUTION 97—AFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF EXERCISE AND PHYSICAL ACTIVITY AS KEY COMPONENTS OF A HEALTHY LIFESTYLE, INCLUDING IN COMBATING OBESITY, REDUCING CHRONIC DISEASE, AND LOWERING HEALTH CARE COSTS

Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 97

Whereas data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention indicate that poor diet and physical inactivity cause over 400,000 deaths each year;

Whereas data from the Department of Health and Human Services estimate that 68 percent of adults and 16.9 percent of children of the United States are obese or overweight;

Whereas obesity is associated with more than 30 medical conditions, including cancer, diabetes, heart disease, and hypertension;

Whereas research has clearly demonstrated that increased physical activity can play a direct role in reducing the incidence of chronic diseases, including heart disease and diabetes;

Whereas, given the most recent trends in obesity, 1 in 3 children born in the United States in 2000 is expected to develop diabetes over the course of his or her lifetime;

Whereas research has estimated that moderate aerobic exercise lowers the adult risk for type 2 diabetes by 58 percent, heart disease by 45 percent, colon cancer by up to 50 percent, and breast cancer by up to 30 percent;

Whereas average per capita health spending increased by 40 percent during calendar years 1997 through 2005, but the average per capita spending for the 15 costliest conditions, all associated with obesity, increased 55 percent during those calendar years;

Whereas the potential savings in direct medical costs if all inactive American adults engaged in regular physical activity could be as high as $80,000,000,000;

Whereas approximately half of the direct medical costs associated with diseases that stem from obesity and inactivity are paid for by the government and the taxpayers of the United States through federally funded programs, such as Medicaid and Medicare;

Whereas regular exercise combined with reduced caloric intake has been shown to be most effective in reducing body mass;

Whereas, even if an individual does not lose weight, exercise may provide health benefits to that individual, including psychological benefits such as lower rates of stress and anxiety, lower rates of depression, higher self-esteem, and an improved body image; and

Whereas new research shows that financial incentives can be used to develop or foster good exercise habits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) affirms the importance of exercise and physical activity as key components of a healthy lifestyle, including combating obesity, reducing chronic disease, and lowering health care costs; and

(2) encourages the development of incentives, including responsible economic incentives, to promote exercise and a more physically active and healthy United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 159. Mr. NELSON of Nebraska submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to 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; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 160. Mr. NELSON of Nebraska submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 159. Mr. NELSON of Nebraska submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 4043.

SA 160. Mr. NELSON of Nebraska submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 4037.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on National Parks. The hearing will be held on Wednesday, March 30, 2011, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of this hearing is to consider the President's Fiscal Year 2012 proposed budget for the National Park Service.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, 304 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510–6150, or by email to allison_seyferth@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact David Brooks at (202) 224–9863 or Allison Seyferth at (202) 224–4905.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 9, 2011, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, ''The State of the Housing Market.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 9, 2011, at 2:15 p.m. in SD–406.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 9, 2011, at 9:30 a.m., in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The President's 2011 Trade Agenda.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on March 9, 2011, at 10 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Department of Homeland Security.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 9, 2011, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, GOVERNMENT INFORMATION, FEDERAL SERVICES, AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs' Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 9, 2011, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, ''New Tools for Curbing Waste and Fraud in Medicare and Medicaid.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL ASBESTOS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 63 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 63) designating the first week of April 2011 as ''National Asbestos Awareness Week.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements relating to the measure be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 63) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 63

Whereas dangerous asbestos fibers are invisible and cannot be smelled or tasted;

Whereas the inhalation of airborne asbestos fibers can cause significant damage;

Whereas asbestos fibers can cause cancer such as mesothelioma, asbestosis, and other health problems;

Whereas asbestos-related diseases can take 10 to 50 years to present themselves;

Whereas the expected survival time for those diagnosed with mesothelioma is between 6 and 24 months;

Whereas generally, little is known about late-stage treatment of asbestos-related diseases, and there is no cure for such diseases;

Whereas early detection of asbestos-related diseases may give some patients increased treatment options and might improve their prognoses;

Whereas the United States has reduced its consumption of asbestos substantially, yet continues to consume almost 820 metric tons of the fibrous mineral for use in certain products throughout the Nation;

Whereas asbestos-related diseases have killed thousands of people in the United States;

Whereas exposure to asbestos continues, but safety and prevention of asbestos exposure already has significantly reduced the incidence of asbestos-related diseases and can further reduce the incidence of such diseases;

Whereas asbestos has been a cause of occupational cancer;

Whereas thousands of workers in the United States face significant asbestos exposure;

Whereas thousands of people in the United States die from asbestos-related diseases every year;

Whereas a significant percentage of all asbestos-related disease victims were exposed to asbestos on naval ships and in shipyards;

Whereas asbestos was used in the construction of a significant number of office buildings and public facilities built before 1975;

Whereas people in the small community of Libby, Montana, have asbestos-related diseases at a significantly higher rate than the national average and suffer from mesothelioma at a significantly higher rate than the national average; and

Whereas the establishment of a ''National Asbestos Awareness Week'' will raise public awareness about the prevalence of asbestos-related diseases and the dangers of asbestos exposure: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the first week of April 2011 as ''National Asbestos Awareness Week'';

(2) urges the Surgeon General to warn and educate people about the public health issue of asbestos exposure, which may be hazardous to their health; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit a copy of this resolution to the Office of the Surgeon General.

AFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF EXERCISE AND PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 97.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 97) affirming the importance of exercise and physical activity as key components of a healthy lifestyle, including in combating obesity, reducing chronic disease, and lowering health care costs.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements relating to the measure be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 97) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 97

Whereas data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention indicate that poor diet and physical inactivity cause over 400,000 deaths each year;

Whereas data from the Department of Health and Human Services estimate that 68

percent of adults and 16.9 percent of children of the United States are obese or overweight;

Whereas obesity is associated with more than 30 medical conditions, including cancer, diabetes, heart disease, and hypertension;

Whereas research has clearly demonstrated that increased physical activity can play a direct role in reducing the incidence of chronic diseases, including heart disease and diabetes;

Whereas, given the most recent trends in obesity, 1 in 3 children born in the United States in 2000 is expected to develop diabetes over the course of his or her lifetime;

Whereas research has estimated that moderate aerobic exercise lowers the adult risk for type 2 diabetes by 58 percent, heart disease by 45 percent, colon cancer by up to 50 percent, and breast cancer by up to 30 percent;

Whereas average per capita health spending increased by 40 percent during calendar years 1997 through 2005, but the average per capita spending for the 15 costliest conditions, all associated with obesity, increased 55 percent during those calendar years;

Whereas the potential savings in direct medical costs if all inactive American adults engaged in regular physical activity could be as high as $80,000,000,000;

Whereas approximately half of the direct medical costs associated with diseases that stem from obesity and inactivity are paid for by the government and the taxpayers of the United States through federally funded programs, such as Medicaid and Medicare;

Whereas regular exercise combined with reduced caloric intake has been shown to be most effective in reducing body mass;

Whereas, even if an individual does not lose weight, exercise may provide health benefits to that individual, including psychological benefits such as lower rates of stress and anxiety, lower rates of depression, higher self-esteem, and an improved body image; and

Whereas new research shows that financial incentives can be used to develop or foster good exercise habits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) affirms the importance of exercise and physical activity as key components of a healthy lifestyle, including combating obesity, reducing chronic disease, and lowering health care costs; and

(2) encourages the development of incentives, including responsible economic incentives, to promote exercise and a more physically active and healthy United States.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, March 10, at 2:15 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 7; that there be 15 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate proceed to vote, without intervening action or debate, on Calendar No. 7; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements relating to this matter be printed in the RECORD and that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be recognized as in morning business at the times listed below for the purpose of giving their maiden speeches to the Senate: Senator MORAN, Thursday, March 10, at 10:30 a.m. for up to 15 minutes, and Senator COATS, Tuesday, March 15, at 2:15 p.m. for up to 30 minutes. I will say, this is his second maiden speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 2011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until Thursday, March 10, at 10 a.m.; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, there be a period for the transaction of morning business until 2:15 p.m., with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each; that at 2:15 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session as provided under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, at approximately 2:30 p.m., the Senate will vote on confirmation of the nomination of Max Oliver Cogburn, Jr., of North Carolina, to be a U.S. District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:02 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 10, 2011, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

STEVE SIX, OF KANSAS, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT, VICE DEANELL REECE TACHA, RETIRED.

WILLIAM FRANCIS KUNTZ, II, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, VICE NINA GERSHON, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RONALD W. SHARPE, OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE ANTHONY JEROME JENKINS, RESIGNED.

ROBERT WILLIAM MATHEISON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JOHN ROBERTS HACKMAN.

JUAN MATTOS JR., OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JAMES THOMAS PLOUSIS, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DAVID L. GOLDFEIN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DONALD M. CAMPBELL, JR.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JOHN F. KELLY

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. JOSEPH D. KERNAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. ALTHEA H. COETZEE
CAPT. VALERIE K. HUEGEL

IN THE ARMY

I HEREBY APPOINT THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

To be major

ERIK M. BENDA
JOHN R. GRABOWSKI
ANDREW R. HUISMAN
DONALD P. JOHNSON
GEORGE P. LEWIS
SETH D. MIDDLETON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

KEVIN B. DENNEHY
JOHN E. HOEFERT
ELMON R. KRUPNIK
LUIS N. MALDONADO
MARK D. NEWHALL
GLENDA A. SHEARN
GREGORY A. THINGVOLD

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

STEPHEN J. PARKS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

HUNG CAO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

BRANDON M. OBERLING

To be commander

WILLIAM A. BROWN, JR

To be lieutenant commander

WILLIAM M. HAMMESFAHR
HARPREET SINGH

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DENTAL EMERGENCY RESPONDER ACT OF 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 2011

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 570, the Dental Emergency Responder Act. H.R. 570 will allow states to incorporate the valuable resources and knowledge of dentists and dental facilities into their emergency and disaster planning. This legislation is long overdue and will enable our state governments to take an ''all hands on deck'' approach when it comes to disaster response.

As a trained dentist, I know that dental students receive a great deal of general medical training during the course of their education. As a result, dentists are skilled at patient interviews, diagnostic evaluations, triage, suturing, infection control measures, wound dressing, bloodborne pathogens, administration of medications both intravenously and orally, and basic emergency care, to give just a few examples. Indeed, some dentists receive additional training in oral surgery and are specially trained to address emergent trauma to the maxillofacial areas. Despite these qualifications, the National Health Security Strategy precludes states from including dentists and dental schools in their disaster planning framework. This is a serious omission and an unnecessary one. H.R. 570 would strike this language, and without imposing a federal mandate would permit states to evaluate how dentistry can be helpful in times of crisis and public emergencies.

The Dental Emergency Responder Act is a concept whose time has come, and I urge my colleagues in both the House and Senate to support this important legislation.

THE PRESERVATION OF ANTIBIOTICS FOR MEDICAL TREATMENT ACT

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of The Preservation of Antibiotics for Medical Treatment Act.

Every year, two million Americans acquire bacterial infections during their hospital stay, and 90,000 will die from them. 70 percent of these infections will be resistant to the drugs commonly used to treat them.

Drug resistance prolongs the length, cost, and severity of the illness, raising health care costs and reducing health outcomes. In the 1990s, the Institute of Medicine estimated that health care costs were upwards of $5 billion; more recent cost estimates have climbed even higher. According to a recent peer-reviewed article published in the Clinical Infectious Diseases journal, antibiotic resistant infections extended hospital stays between six and 13 days as well as increasing mortality. The researchers concluded that antibiotic resistance costs society over $35 billion nationally.

Antibiotic resistance is a major public health crisis, and yet antibiotics are used regularly and with little oversight in agriculture.

Many of the antibiotics used in agriculture as animal feed additives are also used to treat humans, including tetracyclines, sulfonamides, penicillins, macrolides, aminoglycosides, chloramphenicols, and streptogramins. These classes of antibiotics are critical to our treatment of potentially fatal human diseases. Tetracyclines, for example, are used to treat people potentially exposed to anthrax. Macrolides and sulfonamides are used to prevent secondary infections in patients with AIDS and to treat pneumonia in HIV-infected patients. Penicillins are used to treat infections ranging from strep throat to meningitis.

Despite their importance to human medicine, antibiotics are used routinely to promote growth in livestock agriculture. According to analyses by the Food and Drug Administration, 13.1 million kilograms of antibacterial drugs were sold for use in livestock and poultry, and 3.3 million kilograms were sold for use in humans in 2009. It is unacceptable that 80 percent of antibacterial drugs were sold for use in agriculture in the United States in 2009—rather than for human health purposes.

The overuse of antibiotics in agriculture has been conclusively shown to harm human health.

A 2002 publication in the Clinical Infectious Diseases journal analyzing more than 500 scientific articles concluded that ''many lines of evidence link antimicrobial resistant human infections to food-borne pathogens of animal origin.''

The Institute of Medicine, likewise, concluded that reducing the agricultural usage of antibiotics was necessary. Their 2003 report on Microbial Threats to Health concluded, ''Clearly, a decrease in the inappropriate use of antimicrobials in human medicine alone is not enough. Substantial efforts must be made to decrease inappropriate overuse in animals and agriculture as well.''

Federal agencies, public health organizations, and scientists are united by their concern with the overuse of antibiotics, and its implications for human health.

Despite increased attention to the issue, the response has been inadequate. Part of the problem has been the Food and Drug Administration's, FDA's, failure to properly address the effect of the misuse of animal antibiotics on the efficacy of human drugs.

Although the FDA could withdraw its approval for these antibiotics, its record of reviewing currently approved drugs under existing procedures indicate that it would take nearly a century to remove these medically important antibiotics from the feed given to food producing animals. In October 2000, for example, the FDA began consideration of a proposal to withdraw its approval for the therapeutic use of fluoroquinolones in poultry. The review, and eventual withdraw of approval, took five years to complete. Under its current regulations, the FDA must review each class of antibiotics separately.

For this reason, I introduced the Preservation of Antibiotics for the Medical Treatment Act, PAMTA.

This legislation would phase out the use of the seven classes of medically significant antibiotics that are currently approved for non-therapeutic use in animal agriculture. This bill only restricts the non-therapeutic use of antibiotics in animals; it does not infringe upon the use of these drugs to treat a sick animal.

Addressing this critical issue is not only important for protecting the public's health, but also to ensure that American livestock production remain competitive in international markets.

Nations around the world including those of the European Union, New Zealand, Thailand, and Korea all have either banned or will begin banning the use of antibiotics for the purpose of growth promotion in animal feed. Under World Trade Organization rules, trading partners who implement this ban will have the right to refuse imports that do not meet this standard. Accordingly, if the United States does not conduct similar restrictions, but continues to allow for the non-therapeutic use of antibiotics in livestock, there may be major trade and economic implications.

Limiting antibiotic usage in agriculture is eminently practical, as Denmark's example shows. After banning the non-therapeutic usage of antibiotics, Denmark increased productivity while lowering antibiotic usage. A recently published article in the American Journal of Veterinary Research evaluated the effectiveness of Denmark's ban on non-therapeutic usage of antibiotics, and determined that the ban did not harm agricultural productivity. From 1992 to 2008, antimicrobial usage per kilogram of pig produced decreased from 100 to 49—a decrease of more than 50 percent. At the same time, pig production increased from 18.4 to 27.1 million pigs—an increase of 47 percent. This peer-reviewed evaluation reveals that eliminating non-therapeutic usage of antibiotics helped position Denmark's agricultural industrially globally.

The Preservation of Antibiotics for Medical Treatment Act, therefore, is an urgent trade matter as well as an urgent public health matter.

When we go to the grocery store to pick up dinner, we should be able to buy our food without the worry that eating it will expose our family to potentially deadly bacteria that will no longer respond to our medical treatments. Unless we act now, we will unwittingly be permitting animals to serve as incubators for resistant bacteria.

It is time for Congress to stand with scientists, the World Health Organization, the American Medical Association, and the National Academy of Sciences and do something

to address the spread of resistant bacteria. We cannot afford for our medicines to become obsolete.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MILDRED H. BURNETT

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mildred H. Burnett, who will be celebrating her 100th birthday on March 11 this year. She is a woman who has spent her life giving back to her community through education and public service.

A native Texan, Mildred Burnett was born on March 11, 1911 to Ulta Thomas Herriage and Bessie Farmer Herriage at Prairie Point Community, south of Dodd City in Fannin County. She grew up with her parents and five siblings in Fannin County, Prairie Point Community, English Community, Flag Springs, and Dodd City.

Upon graduating from Windom High School in 1929, Mrs. Burnett went to East Texas State Teachers College in Commerce, Texas (now Texas A&M University at Commerce). In 1939 she began teaching at Flag Springs School in Fannin County—a profession she devoted herself to for over thirty-nine years, teaching grades first through fourth.

In 1934 Mildred married Noel Y. Burnett. The couple celebrated over fifty years of marriage and was blessed through the birth of their son, Lanny Joe Burnett, born in 1944. The family resided on a ranch in Fannin County, close to where Mildred and Noel had been born.

Mrs. Burnett is a lifelong Southern Baptist and is a member at the First Baptist Church of Bonham where she taught Sunday School classes and Vacation Bible School for over fifty years. Known for her charm, generosity of spirit and involvement in the community, Mildred is a member of Delta Kappa Gamma, Retired Teachers Association, Texoma Council of Governments, and is a certified Ombudsman for the Texoma Region. Mrs. Burnett volunteered for the Honey Grove Nursing home and was a pink-lady for the Bonham Hospital. In 1962, Mildred was presented with a certificate at the State FFA Convention for being the ''Mother of the State FFA President.''

Mr. Speaker, I ask those present today to join me in honoring Mildred Burnett as she celebrates her 100th birthday. She has used her years well as educator and public servant, and I wish her many more blessed years.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 8, 2011, I missed rollcall votes No. 163 and No. 164 to attend to a family matter. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall No. 163 and ''yea'' on rollcall No. 164.

EASTERN WASHINGTON RECOGNIZES CITY OF OMAK'S CENTENNIAL

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the 100th birthday of the City of Omak—a wonderful community in Eastern Washington which I have the privilege to represent in Congress.

On February 11, 1911, the City of Omak was officially incorporated, and over the next century, this city would grow to be the largest in Okanogan County. To be sure, there are cities and towns across Washington State which have a remarkably rich history. But Omak—best known as the ''Home of the Omak Stampede'' and the world famous suicide race—has an especially rich character, reinforced by a hardy people living at the foot of the Okanogan Highlands.

The residents of Omak have already marked the centennial with a ''Chronicles of the Okanogan'' book release. And in the next few months, the Omak Centennial Committee will be organizing more special festivities including a ''Paint the Town'' interactive art event, the showing of the ''Paint the Town'' artwork, an all-class reunion, and a Centennial-themed Twilight Christmas Parade.

On this Centennial, we should all reflect on the hard work and dedication of the pioneering citizens who founded Omak and have helped sustain it for over 100 years.

Today, I thank and congratulate all of the organizers, volunteers, and residents for helping to mark this important milestone in the community's history.

In particular, I want to thank Mayor Cindy Gagne, City Administrator Ralph Malone, The Omak Centennial Committee—including the Committee Chair Corina Radford and Treasurer Debbie Lampe—and the event sponsors: Havillah Road Printing, RockWall Cellars, the Omak Chamber of Commerce, and The Omak-Okanogan County Chronicle. Special thanks should also go to the Okanogan County Society and Heatherdale's Frame Shop.

Because of them—and many others—the future of Omak is in good hands.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD L. HANNA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for votes. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall votes 163 and 164.

HONORING THE LIFE OF GLENDA CULPEPPER

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Glenda Culpepper, who will receive the 2011 Lifetime Achievement Award from the Whitesboro Area Chamber of Commerce on March 25th, 2012.

Mrs. Culpepper's tremendous contributions to her community go above and beyond the call of duty. She began volunteering as a young wife and mother, serving in her church and multiple civic organizations. This is a lifestyle she has led for over forty years.

Glenda Culpepper has donated her own time and personal resources over the years, working with school organizations and booster clubs, even opening her home to host foreign exchange and college students. In her church, she served as a children and youth worker, camp counselor, Vacation Bible School coordinator, and volunteer in the church nursery.

A charter member of a women's service organization in 1971, which was part of the Texas Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. Culpepper has held various offices within the club and has worked to raise money to provide scholarships for local students.

On the Whitesboro Library Board, which Mrs. Culpepper served on for twenty years, she provided input and direction, volunteered at book sales, summer camps, special presentations, and library events.

Glenda has also served on the Whitesboro Chamber of Commerce for over twenty-five years, where she has served multiple terms on the Board of Directors, been honored as a Lifetime Member of the Chamber, and named Director Emeritus. She has served several terms as the Vice President of Membership Development, and has served on most chamber committees at least once.

Glenda Culpepper's life reflects one of selfless dedication to the betterment of others and her community. She leads by example, both in the public eye and behind the scenes. Her initiative, patience, and tireless effort make her more than deserving of the Lifetime Achievement Award. Mr. Speaker, I ask those present today to join me in honoring this woman for her service and leadership.

HONORING THE YEARS OF SERVICE BY LILLIAN GATTIE TO THE GUNNER FAMILY AND GEORGE ANDROS

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the outstanding service and dedication of Lillian Gattie, who has worked for the Gunner family in California's Central Valley for 75 years.

Born June 1, 1917 to Italian immigrants, Lillian was raised on a 20 acre farm outside of Clovis where she stills resides to this day. It was on the farm that Lillian learned the values of hard work and loyalty that would serve her well in her future career. After graduating from Clovis High School in 1935, Lillian completed business school in Fresno.

Lillian began her 75 years of service to the Gunner family on March 1, 1936 in an office position with the Mission Bell Wine Company, where Vas Gunner was Vice President of Sales. Lillian continued to work for Vas Gunner when he later formed the Argun Wine Company, a successful wine distributer. Lillian

was essential in handling everything from orders to accounting. As Vas Gunner continued to expand his business, Lillian's responsibilities grew as well.

In the late sixties, Vas' son Richard partnered with George Andros to form Gunner and Andros Investments. Again, Lillian's duties expanded to meet the ever growing demands of the company. With Lillian's help and dedication to hard work, the company has grown into one of Fresno's leaders in commercial real estate construction and management.

In 2006, Lillian was quoted in the Fresno Bee, "Why would I want to quit? . . . I still really enjoy working, it keeps me going." As a testament to her work ethic, Lillian reports to work at 9 a.m. on the dot, just as she has for the past 75 years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the hard work and dedication that Lillian Gattie has shown throughout her many years of service to the Gunner Family and George Andros. I congratulate her on her years of dedicated and successful work in our Valley.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LOCAL FUNDS CONTINUATION ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer the District of Columbia Local Funds Continuation Act, to permanently protect both the 600,000 residents of the District of Columbia and the Federal Government from an unintended catastrophe in any future Federal Government shutdown. The bill would allow the District to spend its local funds at the start of a fiscal year if Congress has not approved the District's budget by such time and thereby avoid a District government shutdown if the Federal Government shuts down. Although the District raises and manages its own $8 billion budget, Congress technically appropriates these local funds back to the District, a holdover and throwback to the pre-home-rule period. Several years ago, Republican appropriators and I reached a bipartisan agreement to approve the District's local budget in the first continuing resolution, CR, allowing the District to spend at next year's level, if Congress has not passed the District's regular appropriation bill by the start of the fiscal year. We are grateful that this agreement has held through Democratic and Republican congresses and administrations. This agreement has enabled the District to operate its complex big-city functions more effectively than during the many years when the city's local budget was only approved months after the start of the fiscal year.

However, this year we see the limits of even this helpful agreement. As I speak, if the Federal Government shuts down when the current fiscal year 2011 CR expires on March 18, 2011, the District government would shut down as well, even though the city's local budget was forwarded to Congress on time last year. I am working with our Senate allies to permit the District to spend its local funds for the remainder of fiscal year 2011, but, regardless of whether the Federal Government shuts down this year, a permanent solution has become necessary to avoid disruptive, unintended consequences. The District of Columbia Budget Autonomy Act, to end the antidemocratic anachronism of Congress appropriating to the District its own local funds in the first place, is, of course, the best long-term solution, but today's bill is a critical stopgap measure.

The District urgently needs relief now because even more is at stake than the cessation of vital municipal services. If the District shuts down, it could default under certain financing agreements and leases. When Congress cannot reach agreement on regular appropriation bills, it often operates under successive CRs to avoid a Federal Government shutdown. However, successive CRs greatly hinder the operations of the District. Not only do they make it difficult for the city to plan its activities for the year, successive CRs greatly increase the city's costs of doing business. The city's partners, from Wall Street to small vendors, may charge it a risk premium due to the uncertainty created by successive CRs.

Members who were not here during the last Federal Government shutdown are probably unaware that the District government was forced to shut down, too. The District government had passed its budget months earlier, but Congress had not yet voted for final approval. I am grateful that after the first of several government shutdowns and partial shutdowns, Speaker Newt Gingrich and I worked together to ensure that the District remained operating.

Disputes over the Federal budget have nothing to do with the District's local funds. I do not believe that any Member wants to shut down the D.C. government and bring a large, complicated city to its knees because of a purely Federal matter. Moreover, D.C. residents are not alone in relying on vital District services. Federal officials, including the President, Federal buildings, foreign embassies and dignitaries, and businesses rely daily on the city's services, as well.

It is time we remove the District and the multiple, unintended consequences of a District government shutdown from Federal Government shutdown controversies. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF MOUNTAIN LAKES, NEW JERSEY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Borough of Mountain Lakes, in Morris County, New Jersey, which is celebrating its 100th Anniversary in 2011.

From its inception, Mountain Lakes, a community in my congressional district, has promoted family life and interaction with nature.

In 1910, Mountain Lakes was just rural woodland owned by a handful of families. The following decade, however, changed Mountain Lakes forever. Developers urbanized the hills, woods, swamps and boulders of Mountain Lakes to create a neighborhood where families could enjoy the nature, recreation and simple pleasures of life. The plan also included two manmade lakes, to provide outdoor swimming and boating for the community. By late 1912, the railroad station was completed and with a train line to New York, growth and prosperity soon followed.

Unusual about this community is the nearly 500 homes that were built by one developer. Today, 454 of these homes remain standing, making them one of the largest collections of Craftsman-influenced houses in the United States.

Along with their respect for their architectural history, comes Mountain Lakes' appreciation for education. Its schools provide area students with the foundation they need for a successful future. Mountain Lakes High School is often ranked as a top school by New Jersey Monthly. The Lake Drive School for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing and the Craig School are two schools that offer education to students with special needs.

The developers' vision for this community has survived to the present. The natural and architectural character that was constructed in the early 20th century is still a key feature "Lakers" appreciate today. And, with its natural beauty, picturesque location and charm, Mountain Lakes still attracts residents who enjoy outdoor activities and community involvement.

Today, the grand gardens have been simplified, houses renovated, but still the essential character remains. The rustic suburb of Mountain Lakes has maintained its unique character and environment created in the two decades following its founding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Borough of Mountain Lakes as they celebrate their 100th Anniversary.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CLIFFORD O. POUNDS

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Clifford O. Pounds of Emory, Texas, who passed away on July 31, 2010 at the age of eighty-nine. My staff and I are saddened that we were unable to obtain a Purple Heart medal for Mr. Pounds. He is among an unknown number of veterans who sustained serious injuries on the battlefields of the world, yet did not receive the medal—some because a tragic fire at the St. Louis, Missouri National Personnel Records Center burned 80% of the veterans' records and thereby erased the proof of them having earned the proper award—or some, like Clifford Pounds, who didn't complain of serious injuries sustained in battle, especially during the battle for control of North Africa against a German commander dubbed the "Desert Fox" who led the then great and feared "Afrika Korps"—one of the greatest battles of WWII.

Clifford was born to John Clovis Pounds and Mary Oneida Pounds on September 10, 1921 in Yantis, Texas. He attended school at Emory High School before attending the Sheet Metal Workers Trade School in Corpus Christi. The skills he developed there were something he would continue to use for the benefit of others his entire life.

Mr. Pounds was inducted into the Army Air Force on September 24, 1942 at the age of 22. A decorated World War II veteran, he served his country with the 34th Depot Repair Squadron where his talent as a sheet metal worker was used to repair bullet ridden planes.

The records reflect that Mr. Pounds fought alongside his Squadron in the Rome-Arno, Naples-Foggia, Po Valley and Southern France battles and campaigns. He also spent several months in North Africa fighting the German Afrika Korps commanded by Field Marshal Erwin Rommel. While serving in North Africa, Mr. Pounds suffered wounds from a German bomb that landed and exploded approximately twenty feet from him. Large pieces of hot flak imbedded into his back, and his hip was crushed resulting in a permanent limp. His family gave us these direct quotations—made by Mr. Pounds—and we have no reason to doubt the veracity of his description of his wounds, nor his reason for not obtaining medical information.

Following medical treatment by a British doctor, he served three additional years before being honorably discharged. Mr. Pounds was among the brave and compassionate soldiers who stormed the Nazi Concentration camps, rescuing and liberating their victims. In addition, he was also responsible for guarding German prisoners, and rounding up the German citizens surrounding those camps.

Upon time of discharge in October of 1945, I am told that when asked if he received any wounds, Mr. Pounds humbly declined to disclose his injuries. He considered his own wounds sustained at the beginning of his military service insubstantial in light of what he witnessed in war—comrades who lost their lives, and the atrocities he observed at the concentration camps. War decorations awarded to Mr. Pounds include the Good Conduct Metal and the EAMET Ribbon (''Europe-Africa-Middle Eastern Campaign''). However, because Mr. Pounds did not complain about his war injuries, and no medical records from the British doctor who operated on his back exist, Mr. Pounds has yet to receive a much-deserved Purple Heart. My staff and I attempted to acquire first-hand accounts from fellow soldiers who could formally verify his wounds. We were unable to contact the veterans Mr. Pounds served with from Emory, or his comrades he fought alongside, due to the fact that they preceded him in death.

On March 16, 1973 Clifford O. Pounds married Evelyn Mayfield in Corpus Christi. A devoted husband and family man, he celebrated thirty-seven years of marriage with his wife, during which time they were blessed with six children.

Clifford Pounds was also known as a man of deep faith and quiet leadership. He was a member of the Church of Christ, taught bible study classes, and could be found daily reading his bible in his family's dining room every morning. Staying ''behind the scenes,'' he preferred to quietly help those in need rather than seek out credit for his actions. If an elderly or disabled person needed home repairs, he would readily offer his services until the repair was complete. It was also not uncommon for him to answer a 1:00 or 2:00 phone call in the morning just to be a sympathetic ear for someone needing to talk.

Clifford O. Pounds is preceded in death by his sisters, Joy Sickles and Mary Jo Hart, and his son, Russell Cole. He is survived by his wife Evelyn; their children Sheron McCain, Dell Pounds, Donna Draudt, Lisa Preuss, and Mike Pounds; as well as seven grandchildren and eight great-grandchildren.

Mr. Pounds was such a kind and deserving man and veteran, that I was proud to search and search for the proof required, and am so disappointed that I am still working for his Purple Heart award.

Clifford Pounds was an American patriot and man of faith who lived with honor and integrity. He had a compassionate heart for those less fortunate, and gave generously of himself in all aspects of his life. It has pained me to know how entitled Mr. Pounds was to receive his Purple Heart, but I am proud to have gone the last mile trying to get the award to one so deserving. I am personally acquainted with the Pounds family, and we all know that although I was unable to get testimony for presentation for the Purple Heart, that on the 31st of July, 2010—the date of his death—we said goodbye to a great American, a great patriot, and a loving husband, father and grandparent to those who loved him. God, and those buddies he served with, know of his sacrifices. Though he will probably never receive a Purple Heart award, he proudly walks those streets paved with gold, and he will always be remembered as a fiercely loyal soldier, a true and loving family man, and a Red, White and Blue American that we will never forget. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues present today to join me in honoring this unsung American hero, Mr. Clifford O. Pounds.

RECOGNIZING TAIWAN'S 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STRAIT EXCHANGE FOUNDATION

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, recently we have seen many breakthroughs in cross-strait relations: direct, scheduled flights, direct shipping and postal services, a framework for financial cooperation and investment. On June 29, 2010 Taiwan and Mainland China signed the historic Economic Cooperation Framework Agreement (ECFA) in Chongqing, China. At the moment, Taiwan's Strait Exchange Foundation (SEF) and Mainland's Association for Relations Across the Taiwan Strait (ARATS) are discussing and exploring further measures to improve cross-strait relations.

It is apparent to the international community that the tone of Taiwan-mainland relations has improved significantly. With the conclusion of numerous cross-strait agreements, economic and cultural ties between Taiwan and mainland China can be expected to grow in the future. I am happy to see increased stability in the Taiwan Strait and upsurge in Taiwan-mainland economic, cultural and people-to-people contacts.

Mr. Speaker, these acheivements would not have been possible without the hard work of President Ma Ying-jeou and the leaders of Taiwan's Mainland Affairs Council (MAC) and the Straits Exchange Foundation. On the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Straits Exchange Foundation, I applaud the courage shown by President Ma in taking steps to improve cross-strait relations.

Again, on this anniversary, it is my belief that future stability in the strait will depend on open dialogue between Taiwan and Mainland China, free of force and intimidation and consistent with Taiwan's flourishing democracy. In order for Taiwan to deal with Mainland China confidently, Taiwan needs to be confident in its role in the international community, its ability to defend itself and its place in the global economy.

The United States must continue to support Taiwan's meaningful participation in international organizations. We must help Taiwan feel that it has the physical capacity to resist intimidation by selling defense articles and services to Taiwan, consistent with the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA). Lastly, we must explore new initiatives to expand our economic relationship with Taiwan.

CONGRATULATORY REMARKS FOR THE SAFE RETURN OF SPACE SHUTTLE ''DISCOVERY''

HON. SANDY ADAMS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mrs. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome home the Space Shuttle *Discovery* and its crew of six from the STS–133 mission. The Space Shuttle *Discovery* landed safely at Kennedy Space Center located in Florida's 24th Congressional District this morning. The brave astronauts of *Discovery* spent 13 days in Space and delivered their payload to the International Space Station flawlessly.

This is the final flight of the Space Shuttle *Discovery* and with its now 39th successful mission since 1984, including the delivery of the Hubble Space Telescope and the Ulysses robotic probe, we will bid farewell to the most traveled spacecraft in our fleet. *Discovery* has carried over 180 courageous astronauts to space including the first female shuttle commander and shuttle pilot in history and has been a symbol of space exploration and technological innovation for decades.

I offer my congratulations on a job well done to Commander Steve Lindsey, Pilot Eric Boe, and Mission Specialists Alvin Drew, Steve Bowen, Michael Barratt, and Nicole Stott. They are true American heroes and pioneers in the race for discovery and exploration. Welcome home team.

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL GROUND WATER ASSOCIATION

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to recognize the efforts of the National Ground Water Association (NGWA), which is headquartered in my district in Westerville, Ohio. NGWA is sponsoring National Ground Water Awareness Week which began on March 6. Each year, this event puts the national spotlight on a critically important issue, the preservation and protection of groundwater for human and environmental purposes.

National Ground Water Awareness Week is the pinnacle of NGWA's year-round effort to

educate the public about proper groundwater and water well stewardship. For private household well owners, stewardship includes regularly testing their well water quality and treating it if necessary. An estimated 95 percent of America's available fresh water is in the form of groundwater.

NGWA is a nonprofit organization composed of more than 12,000 U.S. and international groundwater professionals—contractors, equipment manufacturers, suppliers, scientists, and engineers—is dedicated to advancing groundwater knowledge. NGWA's vision is to be the leading groundwater association that advocates the responsible development, management, and use of water.

Association members will be using Ground Water Awareness Week to participate in a variety of activities and events. I want to thank them for their efforts to preserve, protect and safely utilize this most valuable resource.

ANGIE GIARRATANO TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Angie Giarratano of Pueblo, Colorado. Before her passing, she was a philanthropist and longtime leader in her community. She raised thousands of dollars for various charities and brought recognition to a number of other causes.

In addition to her philanthropic work, Ms. Giarratano worked full time, raised two children and was an active member of her church. She also was a grandmother to four and great-grandmother to five. Her husband, John Giarratano, was a World War II hero who played an important role in the D-Day invasion. After the war, he became a small business owner and, like his wife, was a key leader in the community. Family was an important part of Ms. Giarratano's life and was one of the reasons she became such a valuable citizen of Pueblo. While raising a family, she volunteered for the Rocky Mountain Chapter of the Alzheimer's Association and was very active in the American Cancer Society. Ms. Giarratano also worked as the collection manager for the Pueblo Credit and Collection Bureau.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of Angie Giarratano and her family's legacy. It is an honor to recognize her life today.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF DANIEL KANE

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and remembrance of Daniel Kane, who devoted his life to the assistance of others and to improving the well being of the Cleveland community.

Daniel was born and raised in Slavic Village, in the very same house his mother had been raised. Through his commitment to serving others, he helped bring about several significant improvements within the community. He founded the Morgana little league, which provided the youth of his community an opportunity to participate in America's pastime, baseball. He also established the first community garden for Slavic Village, which would eventually be named in honor and recognition of his hard work.

Daniel's devotion to his community and country was apparent from the early years of his life. He served his country in the Second World War, risking life and limb. After the war he began to work for the Cleveland Division of Police as a patrolman and would eventually work his way up to the rank of detective. He retired from the force in 1978, but could not be separated from his devotion to the community. He continued to serve as an Investigative Counselor for the Cleveland Board of Education.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in remembering the distinguished life of Daniel Kane, whose legacy of community involvement is admirable. I extend my deepest and sincerest condolences to his wife Yolanda and his children, Diane, Donna and Daniel Jr.

A TRIBUTE TO THE FOLSOM HIGH SCHOOL VARSITY FOOTBALL TEAM ON THEIR 2010 CIF STATE CHAMPIONSHIP WIN

HON. DANIEL E. LUNGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Folsom High School Bulldogs Varsity Football Team for their 2010 CIF Division II State Championship win on December 18, 2010.

With their win at the CIF Division II State Championship in Carson, against Serra High School of Gardena, the team joins the level of elite high school football teams in the State. Their win is a source of pride for the students, faculty, and the alumni of Folsom High School, as well as the residents of Folsom.

The Bulldogs had an impressive season in which they attained a 14–1 record. Along the road to the State Championship, the Folsom Bulldogs had one of the greatest playoff runs in Section history. After defeating a solid 6–4 Roseville team 56–13 in the first round, the Bulldogs then steamrolled the 10–1 Vacaville Bulldogs 75–6 in round two. In the Section Semi-finals the Folsom Bulldogs traveled to Atwater to face the 12–0 Buhach Colony Thunder. The Bulldogs defeated the Thunder 55–20. In front of a record crowd of 20,000 plus fans, the Bulldogs battled the nationally ranked Grant Pacers to a 41–20 victory and the Division II Section Championship. Winning the Section Championship in the toughest division in the San Joaquin Section and finishing the season with a 13–1 record earned the Folsom Bulldogs a State Bowl berth. This set the matchup between the 13–1 Folsom Bulldogs and the 14–0 Serra Cavaliers in the Division II State Championship. The Serra Cavaliers came into the State Championship game with a 29-game winning streak. The Folsom Bulldogs proved to be too much for the Cavaliers as the Folsom Bulldogs rolled to a 48–20 victory. This earned the Folsom Bulldogs their first State Championship and a number 5 National Ranking by MaxPreps.

In their 5 postseason games the Folsom Bulldogs faced teams with a combined record of 55–5 and outscored them 275–79. This is an amazing feat by an amazing team. Postseason awards include Dano Graves winning the title of Cal-Hi State Football Player of the Year and the MaxPreps National Player of the Year. Coach Kris Richardson has been honored as the Nike and MaxPreps Division II State Coach of the Year.

This team represents heart, strength, determination, and resilience. I commend Coach Kris Richardson for his leadership throughout the season, and applaud him and his fellow coaches for keeping the team focused and determined to achieve their goal of a state championship.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the accomplishments of the Folsom High School Varsity Football Team.

CONGRATULATING MR. LANE TOKITA FOR HIS COMMITMENT TO THE CLOSE UP WASHINGTON CIVIC EDUCATION PROGRAM

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Lane Tokita, an outstanding A.P. History teacher at Kauai High School in my district. Mr. Tokita is in Washington this week with his high school students for the Close Up Washington Civic Education Program. The Close Up Foundation is presenting him with an award for his dedication to the program over many years.

Mr. Tokita's students report that his history class is tough but fair. He instills his students with the philosophy that ''Quitting is not an option!'' I experienced first-hand Mr. Tokita's effectiveness as a teacher when I visited his class. The students impressed me with their enthusiasm and lively participation.

Mr. Tokita is a strong supporter of this program to give students a first-hand experience with democracy in our Nation's capital. Using the Close Up curriculum—tied to state history standards—Mr. Tokita helps his students understand how our democracy works, and inspires them to become more active in their school and community.

Over 95 percent of the program's 500,000 participants have reported that the program helped them better understand their roles as citizens.

I salute Mr. Tokita for his dedication to providing a well-rounded civic education for his students. I have requested to have a flag flown over the U.S. Capitol in his honor.

Congratulations to Mr. Tokita and the many students he has helped influence over the years.

THE VOLUNTARY STATE DISCOUNT PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN ACT OF 2011

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce, along with my colleague,

Representative CHELLIE PINGREE, the Voluntary State Discount Prescription Drug Plan Act of 2011—a completely voluntary, commonsense way to offer prescription drugs at affordable prices to millions of Americans currently struggling without prescription drug coverage.

With the enactment of the Affordable Care Act, millions of uninsured Americans will gain access to health insurance and prescription drug coverage. However, the expansion of coverage won't happen until 2014.

In the meantime, high prescription drug costs will continue to be a burden for millions of Americans. This legislation would enable states, at their option, to create state discount prescription drug plans that extend Medicaid-negotiated rebates to citizens up to 300 percent of the poverty line and thereby provide discounts of roughly 40 percent to 50 million uninsured Americans—all at their local pharmacies. Just like HMOs and insurance plans in the private sector, participating states would simply leverage their purchasing power to secure better prices on behalf of their citizens. In that regard, our bill would explicitly authorize recent prescription drug affordability initiatives in states like Maryland, Maine, and Vermont by removing barriers that have to date not been embraced by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

In 2005, my home state of Maryland passed a state discount prescription drug plan law with the near unanimous support of our General Assembly and our then Republican Governor Robert Ehrlich. Unfortunately, that plan was subsequently blocked by the Bush Administration for reasons that have never been credibly explained. As a result, the broad bipartisan will of our state has been thwarted and hundreds of thousands of Marylanders have been deprived of needed access to affordable prescription drugs. In fact, according to an analysis of U.S. Census data conducted by Families USA and the Center for Policy Alternatives, an estimated half million Marylanders would become eligible for immediate prescription drug price relief under this legislation.

Since these plans are created at the state level, we don't believe states should have to ask the federal government's permission in order to establish them. For that reason, our legislation makes clear that Maryland—and any other state that chooses—can set up a state discount prescription drug plan without petitioning CMS for a Section 1115 waiver. Additionally, since these plans rely on government purchasing power rather than government outlays to produce price discounts, we remove CMS's somewhat contrived requirement that states expend some undefined amount of their own money as part of these plans. Beyond modest administrative costs, it simply isn't necessary.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation represents a significant opportunity to empower states to deliver prescription drug affordability to millions of our citizens who don't currently have it. I hope Congress seizes this opportunity, and I invite my colleagues' support.

IN HONOR OF THOMAS G. MASARYK

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Thomas G. Masaryk and in commemoration of the statue that is being dedicated in his honor at the Bohemian National Hall in Cleveland.

Thomas Masaryk was both the founder and the first president of the Czechoslovak Republic. The Czechoslovak Republic was established in 1918 in the aftermath of the First World War; Thomas made two visits to Cleveland in his lifetime, one in 1902 and another in 1918 where he spoke at the National Bohemian Hall.

The statue is a plaster cast of a similar statue that is located in the Czech Cultural Garden at Rockefeller Park. The statue's curator, Frank L. Jarouch, has been a Cleveland resident all of his life and originally dedicated the statue to the Czech Garden in 1961.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please rise with me today in honor and recognition of the dedication of this statue of Thomas G. Masaryk. It is a benefit to the community that stands in memory of a man who chose to make a difference with his life.

THE FEDERAL FIREFIGHTER FLEXIBILITY AND FAIRNESS ACT

HON. JOHN P. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to re-introduce the Federal Firefighter Flexibility and Fairness Act which passed the House of Representatives by voice vote in the 111th Congress. This legislation would correct a longstanding disparity between professional firefighters who are employed by States, counties, or municipalities and Federal firefighters.

In 1985, Congress amended the Fair Labor Standards Act so that firefighters around the country could engage in a practice called "trade time." Trade time allows two firefighters, solely at their option and with the approval of their supervisor, to trade shifts without affecting the pay of either firefighter. The Congress made this change because firefighters work uncommon schedules involving 24-hour shifts and 72-hour workweeks, followed by a period of time away from the firehouse. Trade time enables firefighters to meet personal obligations such as attending a child's birthday or assisting a sick family member without exhausting their annual leave. It also ensures that firehouses across the country can maintain staffing requirements and keep our communities safe.

Federal firefighters are not covered under the Fair Labor Standards Act and therefore have been ineligible for trade time. I am re-introducing this legislation to amend Federal employee labor law to fix this problem.

Federal firefighters work side-by-side with their non-federal colleagues, so this is an issue of equity. Correcting this inequity will help Federal agencies recruit and retain firefighters. Just like other firefighters, Federal firefighters risk their lives on a daily basis. They also accept the irregular hours that their jobs require. This legislation merely gives them some modest flexibility to balance that irregularity and meet their family obligations.

I hope my colleagues will support this bipartisan commonsense legislation.

THE RED ROUTE HIGHWAY THROUGH THE TOWN OF GARNER

HON. RENEE L. ELLMERS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, the Army Corps of Engineers is working to put a highway straight through the town of Garner, in my district, slicing it in half.

I rise today for the Town of Garner, whose voices must be heard.

The Red Route would pass through the living room of Brenda and Jerry Summer, older residents whose children and grandchildren have moved back to Garner to be close to them.

They say it will be the worst thing in the world if they had to move, and have no idea where they would go. Heartbroken, is how Mrs. Summer described the situation.

I rise for the seniors at the Village at Aversboro that moved in with the confidence they are buying their final home.

Instead, they're being put through an emotional period of stress, not knowing where they'll end up.

I stand for the thousands of families that would be displaced and have to find new homes.

I rise for the 140 year old Springfield Baptist Church, and the 2,000 parishioners, who would literally lose all of their property which is some fifty acres of land.

All because of the Clean Water Act and the Army Corps refusal to remove the Red Line from consideration.

The oppressive regulations under the Clean Water Act are stifling economic growth and job creation.

The Act allows a Dwarf Wedge Muscle and a portion of wetlands to paralyze a town and displace countless families and businesses.

It gives the Army Corps of Engineers the power to stop development and job growth in their tracks.

The situation is especially frustrating since the North Carolina Department of Transportation and the North Carolina Turnpike Authority say they will never build the highway.

Even though the road is not a real option, the Army Corps insists on moving forward, spending hundreds of thousands in taxpayer dollars to study road that will never be built.

Meanwhile, the town of Garner is "Closed for Business" and economically crippled as the state spends years studying a road with no future.

I'm not saying the highway should not be built.

I'm simply asking why the federal government is spending millions in tax payer dollars on a road with no future.

Common sense dictates the Army Corps should find a viable option.

Common sense dictates the Army Corps should remove the Red Line from the Map today.

As this map demonstrates, other options are much less destructive and even less costly to build.

These options do not split a town in half and should be studied in place of the Red Line.

The North Carolina Turnpike Authority has already dropped three other options from consideration because of public protests in those towns about the potential harm to the community.

As each day goes by, Garner loses millions of dollars.

Garner stands to lose a project worth $9 million in investments and hundreds of jobs.

Investors are literally walking away while the town stands in limbo, a hostage to a heavy handed government agency.

Further, the proposed route would cut across several tributaries flowing into Lake Benson, a major source of drinking water for Garner.

Runoff from the road would empty into the lake, increasing sedimentation and the risk of other pollutants.

With unemployment in my district at almost 10%, the federal government should get out of the way and let businesses grow.

It's disappointing that the Army Corps, at the behest of Washington regulators, would consider the interests of a few tiny mussels ahead of the interests of the people of Garner.

The Orange Route is the original plan proposed and has been on the map for nearly two decades.

In Garner, millions of dollars in investments and thousands of jobs would be lost.

Twenty-six commercial lots will be destroyed, with a total tax value of over $30 million.

Approximately 510 residential lots in Garner representing a tax value of over $106 million would be leveled.

I came to Washington to stop out of control spending and waste and remove job-killing regulations. It didn't take long to find examples of waste and job-killing regulations right here in our district with the continued study of this "Red Line." This option must be taken off the map so Garner can begin growing again.

Garner families are fighting for their homes and livelihoods, and I stand with them, ready to fight until the Red Line is removed from consideration.

IN RECOGNITION OF CLEVELAND FEDERAL EXECUTIVE BOARD'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 25th anniversary of the Cleveland Federal Executive Board, and to thank all the federal employees in our community for their individual and collective dedication to the public good.

The community of federal employees in Cleveland, Ohio is comprised of more than 25,000 individuals who contribute their talent and expertise daily in an array of roles, including park rangers, administrators, accountants, clerical employees, attorneys, engineers, military personnel, mail carriers, scientists, nurses and physicians.

The professional contributions extended daily by federal employees serve as a foundation of support, safety and security throughout the community. Every day, the environment is protected; the mail is delivered; veterans receive medical care; our national park is preserved; immigrants are guided to citizenship; citizens are provided with benefits and programs; and the universe is studied and explored thanks to federal employees in Northeast Ohio.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring the members of the Cleveland Federal Executive Board and the thousands of federal employees who live and work within the Cleveland community. Their dedication to their work continues to preserve, protect and strengthen our entire community.

UPHOLDING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S TRUST OBLIGATIONS TO NATIVE AMERICANS

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, today I join Congressman DON YOUNG and Congressman DOC HASTINGS in supporting H.R. 887. I explain separately my reasons for doing so, and specifically my concerns about a request for attorney's fees of $227 million. The resolution of the litigation in Cobell v Salazar involved claims that ultimately amounted to a breach of trust by the government to Native Americans. The plaintiffs have been denied the use of money they were otherwise entitled to, according to the settlement. The petition for fees reports that "government officials have abused individual Indian trust beneficiaries" for decades.

While the mismanagement of the Native trust monies is bad enough, a second injury cannot be inflicted on these same peoples by a fee request that is almost a quarter of a billion dollars. It shocks the conscience to see such a large request. Every dollar paid out in legal fees is a dollar the injured Native Americans will not have. That being said, I recognize, and appreciate, the work done by Plaintiffs' counsel on behalf of the claimants, and I recognize the value of that work and the years it took. In this case, the magnitude of the recovery cannot be used as a benchmark to determine attorney's fees. I would prefer to see an accounting of the actual attorney's fees incurred, by the hour, to see how that compares as a bench mark. But a contingency fee based on a resolution that is itself measured in the billions is simply avaricious.

I therefore support this legislation, H.R. 887, that limits the fee award to $50 million. Congress has the ultimate power over Indian affairs. It also has the duty to protect Native American rights. The Constitution grants to Congress the express power to make regulations governing the territory belonging to the United States (Art. IV, Sec. 3, Cl. 2). In addition, the Indian Commerce Clause conveys the express power to Congress over Native American affairs. This clause provides that "Congress shall have the Power . . . to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes." (Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 3). As a result of these powers, it is well established that Congress has plenary power over Indian affairs. It is up to us, members of Congress, to make sure we exercise these supervisory obligations.

Finally, there is what is referred to as the federal government's "trust relationship" between the federal government and the Native American tribes. This trust relationship obligates Congress and the federal government to protect the well-being of Native Americans, peoples who rendered their lands in return for this trust. As elaborated by Supreme Court Justice John Marshall, the tribes of our country are considered "domestic dependant nations" whose relationship to the United States was like "that of a ward to his guardian." We, the guardians in Congress, must now intervene to protect those under our care, especially where a fee dispute now creates a conflict of interest between the class members and their legal counsel.

That brings us to the Cobell settlement. In rectifying the breach of fiduciary duty documented in Cobell, we cannot allow another breach to proceed under our noses. Just as the government has a fiduciary duty to the Native Americans in the first instance in ensuring trust monies are not misappropriated, so too Congress has plenary power to ensure that the Native American class members are not gouged in a fee award. I have long advocated for sensible legal reform. Excessive attorney's fees in cases like this support this advocacy. Though the Cobell litigation was contentious and time consuming, no one can tell me, with a straight face, that a $50 million dollar fee award is not excellent compensation for one case. On behalf of the 21 federally recognized tribes in Arizona, over 250,000 strong, from the Diné in the north, to the Havasupai at the bottom of the Grand Canyon, down to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe in the south, and on behalf of those tribes in between and throughout the United States, I rise in support of H.R. 887.

TRIBUTE TO DENNIS AND JANICE BRINKMAN

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to Dennis Brinkman, Vietnam War veteran and Alpha Gamma Rho brother from Iowa State University, and his wife, Janice Kay Reeder Brinkman, on the special occasion of their 40th wedding anniversary. This special day will take place on March 27, 2011, but family will be celebrating the event in Galena, Illinois, this weekend—March 11–13, 2011.

Mr. and Mrs. Dennis Brinkman were married on March 27, 1971, in West Union, Iowa. Together they raised one child, Ann Marie. Dennis has farmed near Greene and Charles City, Iowa, since 1972. His operation has included beef cattle, farrow-to-finish hog production, soybeans and corn. Jan, a graduate from the University of Northern Iowa, started her career as an elementary school teacher. When Ann Marie turned two, she began working for Greene Limestone Company as a bookkeeper.

Dennis and Jan currently reside in rural Greene, Iowa. Dennis continues to expand his

crop business and serves on the AgVantage FS Board of Directors. Jan is an office manager at Allied Manatts Group L.L.C. in Charles City, Iowa, and an active member of a local mother's club that helps support the Coats for Kids program at St. John Evangelical Lutheran Church.

I salute this lovely couple on the 40th year of their life together, and I know that my colleagues in the United States Congress join me, their friends and family in honoring them on this special occasion.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today our national debt is $14,193,176,753,471.62.

On January 6th, 2009, the start of the 111th Congress, the national debt was $10,638,425,746,293.80.

This means the national debt has increased by $3,554,751,007,177.80 since then.

This debt and its interest payments we are passing to our children and all future Americans.

HONORING BISHOP JAMES E. MCKNIGHT

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the constituents of the Third Congressional District of Florida, I rise to recognize and wish a Happy Birthday to Bishop James E. McKnight, a man of God and leader to the community of Gainesville, FL.

Bishop James E. McKnight was born March 14, 1930, and is a life-long resident of Gainesville, Florida. He has been married to Jessie M. McKnight over 56 years with three sons and one daughter.

As a man for whom education was key, Bishop McKnight graduated from Lincoln High School in Gainesville, Florida and attended Florida A & M University in Tallahassee, Florida. Bishop McKnight was not only a religious and community leader but also a patriot, he joined the U.S. Army and received special training in the Intelligence Division while serving in the Korean War from 1951–1953. Bishop McKnight has been a pastor in the Church of God by Faith for 53 years. He is presiding pastor of Gainesville Church of God by Faith in Gainesville, Florida, where he and his wife have served as leaders for over 50 years.

Under his leadership at Gainesville Church of God by Faith, a new building was built in 1973, and renovated and expanded in 1990. Bishop McKnight is very involved in the community and has served as a Board Member of the Eastside Clinic and development projects and the Black on Black Crime Task Force for many years. He was instrumental in offering their place of worship as a shelter to the residents of the former Kennedy Homes Apartment Building, who were displaced by fire in 2003. He received an award as a distinguished leader in the Gainesville Community in March of 2007. Bishop McKnight is highly respected and well known as a ''Praying Man'' in the Gainesville community and surrounding areas, and the National Church of God by Faith.

HONORING HOPE HOUSE'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Hope House located in the Town of Dover, Morris County, New Jersey as it celebrates its 40th Anniversary.

Hope House, a not-for-profit, multi-service agency, established in 1971, is a Catholic Charity Agency in the Diocese of Patterson. This noteworthy organization serves clients mainly from Morris County, providing professionally based social services, especially for those who are oppressed, powerless, or otherwise disenfranchised. Hope House Social Service Agency advocates fair and just treatment for all individuals. Services are delivered without regard to race, gender, personal belief or circumstances.

Hope House provides numerous programs and clinical counseling for children, adolescents, and adults. They maintain a professional staff of mental health providers with diversified backgrounds. Hope House counselors are therapists, many of whom are board certified. Licensed clinical social workers and professional counselors are also on staff to provide individuals with the care and support they need.

Of the numerous programs Hope House provides, their HIV/AIDS Service extends into Sussex and Warren Counties. This service is a community based program designed to provide comprehensive and centralized AIDS specific services in a compassionate, caring, and confidential environment.

In addition to the excellent health and social services, Hope House also provides domestic home services to those in most need. For instance, the Chore Program assists low income seniors and younger, disabled adults with light household chores. This program enables individuals to maintain independence and may help prevent premature institutionalization. Much like the chore program is the Fix-It Program. This service offers minor home repairs to Morris County low income families, persons with disabilities and seniors.

The Hope House style is warm and welcoming, reflecting personal attention and sensitivity with a dedicated staff and many volunteers and supporters. It is a cherished resource in our community that enables individuals to seek support for a wide range of issues and receive the attention they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Hope House of Dover, New Jersey as they celebrate their 40th Anniversary.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 10, 2011 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 15

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the situation in Afghanistan; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC–217 following the open session.

SD–G50

10 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the Administration's report to Congress, focusing on reforming America's housing finance market.

SD–538

Budget

To hold hearings to examine the report of the Bipartisan Policy Center's Debt Reduction Task Force.

SD–608

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold closed hearings to examine information regarding cyber security and critical electric infrastructure.

SVC–217

Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012 for Tribal Programs.

SD–628

10:15 a.m.

Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the ''Freedom of Information Act'', focusing on ensuring transparency and accountability in the digital age.

SD–226

2:30 p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine realizing NASA's potential, focusing on programmatic challenges in the 21st century.

SR–253

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine enhancing the President's authority to eliminate wasteful spending and reduce the budget deficit.

SD–342

MARCH 16

9 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To receive a briefing on Libya.

SVC–217

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings to examine the legislative presentations from AMVETS, Jewish War Veterans, Military Officers Association of America, Gold Star Wives, Blinded Veterans Association, Non Commissioned Officers Association, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, Fleet Reserve Association.

SDG–50

10 a.m.

Budget

To hold a joint hearing with the Task Force on Government Performance to examine modernizing performance, focusing on using the new framework.

SD–608

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the state of online consumer privacy.

SR–253

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine the report to the President from the National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling.

SD–406

Finance

To hold hearings to examine health reform, focusing on lessons learned during the first year.

SD–215

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Organizational business meeting to consider subcommittee assignments and any pending nominations.

SD–430

10:15 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Joseph M. Torsella, of Pennsylvania, to be Representative to the United Nations for U.N. Management and Reform, with the rank of Ambassador, Department of State.

SD–419

10:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Department of Defense Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of the Navy.

SD–192

2 p.m.

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SD–342

Appropriations

Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Environmental Protection Agency.

SD–124

Aging

To hold hearings to examine securities lending in retirement plans.

SH–216

2:30 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To receive a briefing on Afghanistan, focusing on progress and expectations.

SVC–217

Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine certain nominations.

SD–226

MARCH 17

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the Department of the Air Force in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC–217 following the open session.

SD–G50

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine current global investment trends in clean energy technologies and the impact of domestic policies on that investment.

SD–366

2 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of David Bruce Shear, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, and Kurt Walter Tong, of Maryland, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as United States Senior Official for the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Forum, both of the Department of State.

SD–419

2:30 p.m.

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine catastrophic preparedness, focusing on if FEMA is ready for the next big disaster.

SD–342

MARCH 30

10:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings to examine the legislative presentations from Paralyzed Veterans of America, Air Force Sergeants Association, Military Order of the Purple Heart, National Association of State Directors of Veterans Affairs, Wounded Warrior Project, Vietnam Veterans of America, The Retired Enlisted Association, American Ex-Prisoners of War.

SD–106

2:30 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Public Lands and Forests Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012 for the National Park Service.

SD–366

MARCH 31

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the Department of the Army in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD–G50

APRIL 5

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine U.S. Northern Command and U.S. Southern Command in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC–217 following the open session.

SD–G50

APRIL 12

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine U.S. Pacific Command and U.S. Forces Korea in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SH–219 following the open session.

SD–106

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

House and Senate met in a Joint Meeting to receive the Honorable Julia Gillard, Prime Minister of Australia.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1415–S1513

Measures Introduced: Twenty-two bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 516–537, and S. Res. 96–97. **Pages S1501–02**

Measures Reported:

S. 493, to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, with amendments. **Page S1501**

Measures Passed:

National Asbestos Awareness Week: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 63, designating the first week of April 2011 as ''National Asbestos Awareness Week,'' and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S1512**

Affirming the Importance of Exercise and Physical Activity: Senate agreed to S. Res. 97, affirming the importance of exercise and physical activity as key components of a healthy lifestyle, including in combating obesity, reducing chronic disease, and lowering health care costs. **Pages S1512–13**

Measures Failed:

Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act: By 44 yeas to 56 nays (Vote No. 36), Senate failed to pass 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. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Tuesday, March 8, 2011, requiring 60 affirmative votes for passage of the bill, and the bill was returned to the calendar, after taking action on the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S1422–91**

Rejected:

By 42 yeas to 58 nays (Vote No. 37), Reid (for Inouye) Amendment No. 149, in the nature of a substitute. (Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Tuesday, March 8, 2011, providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.) **Page S1491**

Maiden Speeches—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that the following Senators be recognized, as if in morning business, at the times listed below, for the purpose of giving their maiden speeches to the Senate: Senator Moran, at 10:30 a.m., on Thursday, March 10, 2011 for up to 15 minutes; and Senator Coats, at 2:15 p.m., on Tuesday, March 15, 2011 for up to 30 minutes. **Page S1513**

Cogburn Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at 2:15 p.m., on Thursday, March 10, 2011, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Max Oliver Cogburn, Jr., of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina; that there be 15 minutes of debate, equally divided and controlled in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination, without intervening action or debate; and that no further motions be in order. **Page S1513**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Steve Six, of Kansas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit.

William Francis Kuntz, II, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Ronald W. Sharpe, of the Virgin Islands, to be United States Attorney for the District of the Virgin Islands for the term of four years.

Robert William Matheison, of Virginia, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Virginia for the term of four years.

Juan Mattos Jr., of New Jersey, to be United States Marshal for the District of New Jersey for the term of four years.

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.
1 Army nomination in the rank of general.
1 Marine Corps nomination in the rank of general.
3 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.
Routine lists in the Army and Navy. **Page S1513**

Messages from the House: **Page S1501**

Measures Referred: **Page S1501**

Executive Communications: **Page S1501**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1502–03**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1503–11**

Additional Statements: **Pages S1498–S1501**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S1511**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Pages S1511–12**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S1512**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—37) **Page S1491**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 7:02 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, March 10, 2011. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1513.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION FUNDING

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine funding for the Social Security Administration in fiscal years 2011 and 2012, after receiving testimony from Michael J. Astrue, Commissioner, Social Security Administration; W. Lee Hammond, AARP, and Marty Ford, Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities, both of Washington, D.C.; and Joe Dirago, National Council of Social Security Management Associations, Inc., Newburgh, New York.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of the Interior, after receiving testimony from Ken Salazar, Secretary, David Hayes, Deputy Secretary, and Pam K. Haze, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Budget, Finance, Performance and Acquisition, all of the Department of the Interior.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments for the 112th Congress:

Subcommittee on AirLand: Senators Lieberman (Chair), Nelson (NE), McCaskill, Manchin, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Brown (MA), Inhofe, Sessions, Wicker, and Vitter.

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities: Senators Hagan (Chair), Reed, Udall (CO), Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Portman, Chambliss, Brown (MA), Graham, and Cornyn.

Subcommittee on Personnel: Senators Webb (Chair), Lieberman, Akaka, McCaskill, Hagan, Begich, Blumenthal, Graham, Chambliss, Brown (MA), Ayotte, Collins, and Vitter.

Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support: Senators McCaskill (Chair), Akaka, Nelson (NE), Webb, Udall (CO), Begich, Manchin, Shaheen, Ayotte, Inhofe, Chambliss, Portman, Collins, Graham, and Cornyn.

Subcommittee on Seapower: Senators Reed (Chair), Akaka, Webb, Hagan, Blumenthal, Wicker, Sessions, Ayotte, and Collins.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces: Senators Nelson (NE) (Chair), Lieberman, Reed, Udall (CO), Begich, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Sessions, Inhofe, Wicker, Portman, Cornyn, and Vitter.

Senators Levin and McCain serve as ex-officio members of all subcommittees.

THE STATE OF THE HOUSING MARKET

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the state of the housing market, after receiving testimony from Susan M. Wachter, University of Pennsylvania Wharton School, Philadelphia; Mark A. Calabria, Cato Institute, and David Crowe, National Association of Home Builders (NAHB), both of Washington, DC; Ron Phipps, National Association of Realtors, Warwick, Rhode Island; and Jeffrey Lubell, Center for Housing Policy, Weybridge, Vermont.

SPENDING IN THE TAX CODE

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a hearing to examine distribution and efficiency of spending in the tax code, after receiving testimony from Robert Greenstein, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Robert S. McIntyre, Citizens for Tax Justice, and Scott Hodge, Tax Foundation, all of Washington, DC.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION BUDGET

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012 for the Federal Highway Administration, after receiving testimony from Ray LaHood, Secretary of Transportation.

PRESIDENT'S 2011 TRADE AGENDA

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's 2011 trade agenda, after receiving testimony from Ron Kirk, United States Trade Representative.

WASTE AND FRAUD IN MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security concluded a hearing to examine new tools for curbing waste and fraud in Medicare and Medicaid, after receiving testimony from Peter Budetti, Deputy Administrator and Director, Center for Program Integrity, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, and Daniel R. Levinson, Inspector General, both of the Department of Health and Human Services; Greg Andres, Acting Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, Department of Justice; Kathleen M. King, Director, Health Care, Government Accountability Office; and Helen Carson, Delaware Health and Social Services, Wilmington.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY OVERSIGHT

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Department of Homeland Security, after receiving testimony from Janet Napolitano, Secretary of Homeland Security.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee ordered favorably reported S. 493, to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, with amendments.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 28 public bills, H.R. 964–991; and 7 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 28–29; and H. Res. 155–159 were introduced. **Pages H1664–65**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H1666**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Foxx to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1623**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a recorded vote of 326 ayes to 91 noes with 1 voting "present", Roll No. 167. **Pages H1623, H1641–42**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:04 a.m. for the purpose of receiving The Honorable Julia Gillard, Prime Minister of Australia. The House reconvened at 12:03 p.m., and agreed that the proceedings had during the Joint Meeting be printed in the Record. **Page H1623**

Joint Meeting To Receive The Honorable Julia Gillard, Prime Minister of Australia: The House and Senate met in a joint session to receive The Honorable Julia Gillard, Prime Minister of Australia. She was escorted into the Chamber by a committee comprised of Representatives Cantor, McCarthy (CA), Hensarling, Dreier, Ros-Lehtinen, McKeon, Camp, Brady (TX), Manzullo, Pelosi, Hoyer, Clyburn, Larson (CT), Becerra, Berman, Faleomavaega, Lowey and Crowley; and Senators Reid, Durbin, Kerry, Boxer, McConnell, Alexander, Barrasso, and Lugar. **Pages H1624–26**

Committee Election: The House agreed to H. Res. 155, electing a Member to a Standing Committee of the House of Representatives. **Page H1626**

Emergency Mortgage Relief Program Termination Act—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 151, the rule that provides for consideration of H.R. 836, to rescind the unobligated funding for the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program and to terminate the program, by voice vote after the previous question was ordered without objection. **Pages H1629–35**

FHA Refinance Program Termination Act—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 150, the rule that provides for consideration of H.R. 830, to rescind the unobligated funding for the FHA Refinance Program and to terminate the program, by

a recorded vote of 240 ayes to 180 noes, Roll No. 166, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 235 yeas to 186 nays, Roll No. 165. **Pages H1635–41**

Moment of Silence: The House observed a moment of silence in honor of the men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our nation in Iraq and Afghanistan, their families, and all who serve in the armed forces and their families. **Page H1641**

Joint Economic Committee—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Joint Economic Committee: Representatives Hinchey, Maloney, Loretta Sanchez, and Cummings. **Page H1642**

Speaker Pro Tempore Designation: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representatives Lewis (CA), Thornberry, Upton, Harris, and Wolf to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through the remainder of the One Hundred Twelfth Congress. **Page H1642**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H1623.

Senate Referral: S. 23 was held at the desk.

Amendments: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on pages H1666–68.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1640, H1641, H1641–42. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5:31 p.m.

Committee Meetings

REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee, held a mark-up on H.R. 872, The Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2011, and adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The committee ordered the bill reported, as amended, favorably.

INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing on National Park Service FY 2012 Budget Oversight. Testimony was heard from the following National Park Service officials: Jonathan Jarvis, Director; C. Bruce Sheaffer, Comptroller; and Margaret O'Dell, Deputy Director of Operations, National Park Service.

DEFENSE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on FY 2012 Navy/Marine Corps Budget Overview. Testimony was heard from Raymond Mabus, Secretary of the Navy; ADM Gary Roughead, Chief of Naval Operations; and Gen. James Amos, Commandant of the Marine Corps.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Army Corps of Engineers FY 2012 Budget Requests. Testimony was heard from Jo Ellen Darcy, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works; and Lt. Gen. Robert Van Antwerp, Chief of Engineers.

HOMELAND SECURITY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a hearing on FY 2012 Oversight and Budget Department of Homeland Security. Testimony was heard from Alan Bersin, Commissioner, Customs and Border Protection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Oversight of Veterans Programs. Testimony was heard from Richard Griffin, Deputy Inspector General, Veterans Affairs Office of Inspector General.

STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs held a hearing on FY 2012 Budget Request for the Department of the Treasury International Programs. Testimony was heard from Timothy Geithner, Secretary of the Treasury.

ARMY MODERNIZATION

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on Army modernization. Testimony was heard from GEN Peter W. Chiarelli, Vice Chief of Staff, USA; LTG Robert P. Lennox, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army; LTG General William N. Phillips, USA, Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Acquisition, Logistics and Technology); J. Michael Gilmore, Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, Office of the Secretary of Defense; Michael J. Sullivan, Director of Acquisition and Sourcing, GAO; and William Graveline, Assistant Director, Acquisition and Sourcing Management Team, GAO.

NAVY SHIPBUILDING

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces held a hearing on Navy shipbuilding acquisition programs and budget requirements of the Navy's shipbuilding and construction plan. Testimony was heard from Ronald O'Rourke, Specialist in National Defense, Congressional Research Service; Eric J. Labs, Senior Analyst for Naval Forces and Weapons, CBO; Sean J. Stackley, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition; VADM John T. Blake, USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Integration of Capabilities and Resources; Lt. Gen. George J. Flynn, USMC, Commanding General, Marine Corps Combat Development Command.

BUDGET—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a hearing on the Budget and Policy Proposals of the U.S. Department of Education. Testimony was heard from Arne Duncan, Secretary of Education.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing on H.J. Res. 37, Disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to regulating the Internet and broadband industry practices. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

The subcommittee held a mark-up of the bill immediately after the hearing and forwarded the bill to the full Committee without amendment.

HEALTH CARE FUNDING

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health hearing entitled "Setting Fiscal Priorities in Health Care Funding." Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee, continued mark-up of the following: H.R. 839, the HAMP Termination Act of 2011 and H.R. 861, the NSP Termination Act. Both bills were ordered reported as amended.

CHINA'S TRADE AND INVESTMENT

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade held a hearing on China's Indigenous Innovation Trade and Investment Policies: How Great a Threat? Testimony was heard from Karen Laney, Acting Director, International Trade Commission and public witnesses.

FY 2012 BUDGET—FEMA

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications held a hearing entitled "Ensuring Effective Preparedness and Response—An Assessment of the Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Request for the Federal Emergency Management Agency." Testimony was heard from W. Criag Fugate, Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security.

SECURING AIR COMMERCE

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Transportation Security held a hearing entitled "Securing Air Commerce From the Threat of Terrorism." Testimony was heard from John Sammon, Assistant Administrator, Transportation Sector Network Management, TSA; and Stephen Lord, Director, Homeland Security and Justice Issues, GAO.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on House Administration: Full Committee, held a mark-up on H.J. Res. 147, providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Twelfth Congress, was reported favorably. The Committee also approved the following Committee resolutions: Approve Franked Mail Allowances for Committees for the 112th Congress: Approve Committee Views and Estimates for Fiscal Year 2012; and Approve a Committee Consulting Contract.

AMERICAN INNOVATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, Competition and the Internet held a hearing on Driving American Innovation: Creating Jobs and Boosting our Economy. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PATRIOT ACT REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security held a hearing on the Reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act. Testimony was heard from Todd Hinnen, Acting Assistant Attorney General, National Security Division, Department of Justice; Robert S. Litt, General Counsel, Office of the Director of National Intelligence; and public witnesses.

FY 2012 BUDGET—GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing to "Examine the Spending Priorities and the Missions of the U.S. Geological Survey and the President's FY 2012 Budget Proposal." Testimony was heard from Marcia McNutt, Director, Geological Survey; and public witnesses.

CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL REPORT

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Organization, Efficiency and Financial Management held a hearing entitled ''A Look at the FY10 Consolidated Financial Report of the U.S. Government.'' Testimony was heard from Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General, GAO; Richard L. Gregg, Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury; and Daniel I. Werfel, Controller and Director, Office of Federal Financial Management, OMB.

IMPACT OF REGULATION ON MANUFACTURERS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs, Stimulus Oversight and Government Spending held a hearing entitled ''Assessing the Cumulative Impact of Regulation on U.S. Manufacturers.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FEDERAL WORKER PAY

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, U.S. Postal Service and Labor Policy held a hearing entitled ''Are Federal Workers Underpaid?'' Testimony was heard from John Berry, Director, OPM; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 2011

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of Transportation, 9:30 a.m., SD–138.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of Justice, 11 a.m., SD–192.

Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of Agriculture, 2 p.m., SD–124.

Committee on Armed Services, to hold hearings to examine the current and future worldwide threats to the national security of the United States; with the possibility of a closed session in SH–219 following the open session, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance and Investment, to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012 for the Securities and Exchange Commission, 9:30 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on the Budget, to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2012 for defense and international affairs, 10 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Philip E. Coyle, III, of California, to be an Associate Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, Executive Office of the President, Kathryn D. Sullivan, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Frances M.D. Gulland, of California, to be a Member of the Marine Mammal Commission, and Ann D. Begeman, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, to hold hearings to examine S. 398, to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to improve energy efficiency of certain appliances and equipment, and S. 395, to repeal certain amendments to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act with respect to lighting energy efficiency, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance, to hold hearings to examine innovations in child welfare waivers, focusing on a pathway to reform, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, to hold hearings to examine Bridgepoint Education, Inc., focusing on a case study in for-profit education and oversight, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Carolyn N. Lerner, of Maryland, to be Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine information sharing in the era of WikiLeaks, focusing on balancing security and collaboration, 3 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary, business meeting to consider S. 193, to extend the sunset of certain provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act, S. 222, to limit investor and homeowner losses in foreclosures, and the nominations of Caitlin Joan Halligan, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Jimmie V. Reyna, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit, John A. Kronstadt, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, Vincent L. Briccetti, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, Arenda L. Wright Allen, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia, and Michael Francis Urbanski, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Virginia, 10 a.m., SD–226.

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

House

Committee on Agriculture, Full Committee, hearing to review the impact of EPA regulation on agriculture, 2 p.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies on Bureau of Land Management FY 2012 Budget Oversight, 9:30 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies on Department of Agriculture FY 2012 Budget Request, 10 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies on National Science Foundation (NSF) FY 2012 Budget Request, 10 a.m., H–309 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government on Executive Office of the President, 10 a.m., HT–2 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies on Bureau of Reclamation FY 2012 Budget Requests, 10 a.m., 2362–B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies on Department of Education: FY12 Budget Request, 10 a.m., 2358–B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies on FY 2012 Budget Request Department of Housing and Urban Development, 10 a.m., 2358–A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations and Related Agencies on State Department FY 2012 Budget Request, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies on Office of Surface Mining FY 2012 Budget Oversight, 11 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies on Navy and Marine Corps FY 2011 Budget Request, 2 p.m., H–140 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies on Major Management Challenges at the Forest Service, 2 p.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security FY 2012 Oversight and Budget, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on global challenges to readiness and the fiscal year 2012 budget request, 10:30 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee hearing entitled "Lifting the Crushing Burden of Debt," 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor and Pensions hearing on The Pressures of Rising Costs on Employer Provided Health Care, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, mark-up on H.R. 910, the Energy Tax Prevention Act of 2011, 9 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises, hearing entitled "Oversight of the Securities and Exchange Commission's Operations, Activities, Challenges and FY 2012 Budget Request," 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy, hearing entitled "The Role of the Export-Import Bank in U.S. Competitiveness and Job Creation," 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing on North Korea's Sea of Fire: Bullying, Brinkmanship and Blackmail, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Europe and Eurasia, Overview of U.S. Relations with Europe and Eurasia, 2:30 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia, hearing on Assessing U.S. Foreign Policy Priorities and Needs Amidst Economic Challenges in the Middle East, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, hearing entitled "The Extent of Radicalization in the American Muslim Community and that Community's Response," 9:30 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, Competition and the Internet hearing on Review of Recent Judicial Decisions on Patent Law, 1 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement hearing on New Jobs in Recession and Recovery: Who Are Getting Them and Who Are Not, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Prior to the hearing the subcommittee will meet to Adopt Rules of Procedure and Statement of Policy for Private Immigration Bills and Statement of Policy on Federal Charters; and to Request Department of Homeland Security Departmental Reports on the Beneficiaries of: H.R. 316, Private Bill for the relief of Esther Njeri Karinge, H.R. 357, Private Bill for the relief of Corina De Chalup Turcinovic, H.R. 794, Private Bill for the Relief of Allan Bolor Kelley, H.R. 823, Private Bill for the Relief of Maria Carmen Castro Ramirez and J. Refugio Carreno Rojas, and H.R. 824, Private Bill for the Relief of Daniel Wachira.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands hearing entitled "Examining the Spending, Priorities and the Missions of National Park Service and the President's FY 2012 Budget Proposal." 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee Business Meeting, 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on TARP, Financial Services and Bailouts of Public and Private Programs and the Subcommittee on Government Organization, Efficiency and Financial Management joint hearing entitled "Financial Management, Work Force, and Operations at the SEC: Who's Watching Wall Street's Watchdog?" 1:30 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee hearing on An Overview of the Fiscal Year 2012 Research and Development Budget Proposals at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the Environmental Protection, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management hearing on Cutting Spending and Consolidating Federal Office Space: GSA's Capital Investment and Leasing Program, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 754, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, and views and estimates on the President's Budget for Fiscal Year 2012, 10 a.m., HVC–304.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, March 10

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 2:15 p.m.), Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Max Oliver Cogburn, Jr., of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina, and after a period of debate, vote on confirmation of the nomination at approximately 2:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, March 10

Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 830—FHA Refinance Program Termination Act (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Adams, Sandy, Fla., E440
Brown, Corrine, Fla., E444
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E444
Costa, Jim, Calif., E438
Ellmers, Renee L., N.C., E442
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E439, E444
Gosar, Paul A., Ariz., E437, E443
Graves, Sam, Mo., E438
Hall, Ralph M., Tex., E438, E438, E439
Hanna, Richard L., N.Y., E438
Hirono, Mazie K., Hawaii, E441
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E441, E442, E443
Latham, Tom, Iowa, E443
Lungren, Daniel E., Calif., E441
McMorris Rodgers, Cathy, Wash., E438
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E439
Sarbanes, John P., Md., E442
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E437
Tiberi, Patrick J., Ohio, E440
Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E441
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E440
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E441

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record,* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.