United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2011 No. 25—Part II

House of Representatives

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011—Continuing

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

The national unemployment rate stands at 9 percent. In California, in my home State, it's 12.5 percent. In Ohio, where the Speaker is from, it's 9.6 percent. And of course, African Americans and Latinos and teenagers have far higher unemployment rates of 15.5, 11.5, and 25.7 percent respectively. Altogether, 13.9 million people are looking for work across the country, 6.2 million of them are classified as long-term unemployed, and yet the Republican response is to cut job training programs. Just think about that for a moment. How in the world does cutting job training programs put people back to work? Madam Chair, I really can't figure out the logic of that. And I wonder how Republicans will explain it to their unemployed constituents. You have unemployed constituents, also.

And so my amendment, on the other hand, is really a very commonsense response to the unemployment problem in our country. This amendment would add language to the continuing resolution from a bill that I introduced with Representative BOBBY SCOTT, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act.

Quite simply, this amendment and my bill would provide an additional 14 weeks of benefits to the existing tier one of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Program in order to help unemployed workers who have exhausted their current benefits. These people have hit the wall.

My amendment includes an emergency designation pursuant to the rules of the House and would not trigger statutory PAYGO rules. This is an emergency. Every single Member of this body has unemployed people in their district, people who just want a chance to get a job, to work hard and to sustain their families. That's all. They just want to be part of this American dream. But for every job opening in this country, there are 4.7 unemployed workers seeking to fill it. Let me repeat that. One job for every 4.7 unemployed workers.

It's clear from that statistic that unemployment is not a problem of self-motivation; it is a symptom of a job deficit. It will take time to close this deficit, and I believe it will require continued government investments to do so, but in the meantime, people have to survive. We have a moral obligation to help the long-term unemployed get through this crisis by extending their benefits now.

□ 0050

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, we must acknowledge that passing a continuing resolution will do nothing to create jobs. We are stuck with an unemployment rate of 9 percent and have left the long-term unemployed who have exhausted their unemployment benefits out in the cold.

Representative LEE's amendment makes it clear that some of us have not forgotten about these individuals and their families. The amendment will ensure that these hardworking Americans will have access to unemployment benefits during this historic economic recession. It's not only the right thing to do, but it will also help our economy.

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

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

We face very difficult choices when it comes to the Federal budget, and there's no easy solution to solve our budget problems. When I first came to Congress in 1993, we considered a budget that put an end to fiscal recklessness. We passed a budget that, by the end of the 8 years of the Clinton administration, would not only have eliminated the deficit but had a projected surplus large enough to have paid off the entire national debt held by the public 2 years ago. That means we would have owed no money to Japan, China, and Saudi Arabia. That budget also led to record job growth, but it required tough choices; and in fact, dozens of Members who voted for that budget lost their seats in the next election.

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

Before that bill was passed, many of us asked how we're going to pay for it, but nobody wanted to answer it. Everybody who supported the bill focused solely on the nice tax cuts. But now we're going to debate a long list of spending cuts in the proposed resolution to show how we're paying for it. The safety net is attacked: low-income energy assistance; Women, Infants and Children's nutrition; the health centers; housing; and investments in our future, like the National Science Foundation, NASA, Pell Grants, job training, clean water, high-speed rail. These are the things that we're cutting to pay for some of last year's tax cut bill. Now the American people are seeing how we're going to pay for it.

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

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

The amendment directly amends existing law.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to speak on the point of order? The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that the amendment proposes directly to change existing law; as such, it constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained.

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

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chair, I rise in disappointment that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) was not made in order.

While the Republicans cut the heart out of necessary, needed programs that would help the people who have lost their jobs—and they've lost these jobs through no fault of their own—it actually stuns me how unaware they are that it is our very obligation in this House to help make families whole again, to help them do what they have to do when they can't find work. But of course it's up to the BARBARA LEEs and the BOBBY SCOTTs of this Congress to insist that we provide a lifeline for hardworking families who have exhausted all of their benefits. It is particularly shameful, Madam Chair, that this is something we're even questioning after giving billions of dollars in deficit-busting tax cuts to the very wealthiest.

After extending those tax breaks for the affluent, how can they say that we can't afford to extend unemployment insurance for families struggling to find jobs in this economy? The Republican leadership has given a lot of lip service to creating jobs, but they've yet to bring even one jobs bill to the floor. Now they have a chance to support emergency relief to millions of working families, a chance to extend unemployment benefits to help struggling families which will also help end the recession because, as it was just said a minute ago, getting people back to work will get our economy going again because working is actually the first crucial step in reducing the deficit.

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

□ 0100

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

I hear amendment after amendment that's denied. We can't even formulate certain amendments because we can only increase, not even increase spending, we can only restore draconian spending cuts on human services that are necessary for our people if we reduce other human services.

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

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

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

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

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

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

So the American people's representatives have our hands tied because we are prisoners of the construct constructed by the Republican Party that says, let the rich have their tax cuts, let the oil companies have their tax breaks, let the multinational companies export the jobs overseas and pay no taxes. We'll pay for it by robbing the American people of transportation, of highways, of bridges, of unemployment insurance, of job creation, of education. That's what we're dealing with here, and the debate should be looked on in the context of the culmination of that 30-year plot by the Republicans which we're seeing, which was freely admitted by a lot of people, starting with Ronald Reagan's budget director who started it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IX—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SEC. 1901. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''House of Representatives, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $1,288,299,072.

AMENDMENT NO. 108 OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 306, line 11, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $1,500,000)''.

Page 359, line 16, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $1,500,000)''.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, this amendment is very simple. We're going through this process, or the continuing resolution, and we're trying to reduce spending to help bring down the Federal debt, which is now around $14 trillion.

I might also say that I would certainly want to commend Chairman ROGERS, ranking member NORM DICKS, and Speaker BOEHNER for allowing unlimited amendments to this continuing resolution. It certainly is an open process. And it's my understanding that over 700 amendments were printed in the RECORD to give Members an opportunity to represent their districts and try to bring spending under control. And I might say, that's in direct contrast to when the health care bill was brought to the floor in the last Congress, a bill, 2,400 pages, that had direct impact on the health care throughout America—not one amendment was in order on the floor. So there certainly is a contrast here in the way we're proceeding with the people's business.

But this amendment basically simply removes $1.5 million from the greening of the Capitol project. There was a total of about $7 million in this project. The project is basically over with, and there is approximately $1.5 million left. If we go on and eliminate the program now, that $1.5 million can be put directly to reducing the debt.

Now, some people would say, well, my gosh, $7 million is not much money. But, back in March of 2009, I wrote a letter to the Architect of the Capitol because one of the parts of the Greening of the Capitol was to stop buying coal for the Capitol power plant. And when they stopped buying coal for the Capitol power plant, a coal mine in West Virginia that was providing that coal closed down and those jobs were lost.

The Architect of the Capitol, in responding to my letter, also indicated that by switching away from coal, the annual cost to the taxpayers of America went up between $7 million and $8 million a year, and that's an ongoing expense. And that does not include the conversion that had to take place with the Capitol power plant, and we know that at least $1.5 million was spent on the conversion. We do not know what additional funds were spent, but the Architect of the Capitol said additional funds were spent. And I might add, there was never any discussion about this on the House floor. There was never any notice given to any of the Members about this. But it came about simply because Speaker PELOSI and Senate Leader HARRY REID wrote a letter to the Architect of the Capitol directing him to do so.

□ 0110

So all we are doing with this amendment is trying to reduce our Federal

debt by $1.5 million. The Greening of the Capitol program is basically over with. In fact, the only thing they are doing now, according to the information I have, is they are calling around to congressional district offices to go down there to see about buying more up-to-date light bulbs. So I would respectfully request that the Members support this amendment.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 4, 2009.

Mr. STEPHEN AYERS,
Acting Architect of the Capitol,
Washington, DC.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

ED WHITFIELD,
Member of Congress.

THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2009.

Hon. ED WHITFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITFIELD: Thank you for your interest in the U.S. Capitol Power Plant. As a matter of background, Congress authorized $1,545,975.65 for the design and construction of the Capitol Power Plant on April 28, 1904, and it was completed and began operations in 1910. Originally, the plant was constructed to produce electricity. However, since 1951 it has not produced electricity and only generates steam and chilled water for the Capitol Complex.

The Capitol Power Plant is currently capable of using three fuels; coal, natural gas, and fuel oil. In a series of projects starting in 1989, individual boilers within the plant have been modified to be capable of burning natural gas. In Fiscal Year 2008, the fuel consumed by the plant was 65% natural gas and 35% coal. The largest amount of coal burned during the last 20 years was in 1993, when the plant used 47,393 short tons. The plant currently burns low sulfur bituminous coal which is purchased through the General Services Administration and the Defense Energy Support Center. The following table provides details on the fuel usage and costs for Fiscal Year 2008:

Utility type	Energy (MMBTU)	Cost ($)
Natural Gas	975,046	$12,653,649
Oil	120	2,291
Coal	528,489	2,444,511
Heating Energy Total	1,503,655	15,100,451

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

On February 26, 2009, the Office of Architect of the Capitol (AOC) received a letter signed by the Speaker of the House and the Senate Majority Leader directing a reduction in the use of coal at the plant, in favor of natural gas. Our preliminary estimates indicate that operating the plant using 100% natural gas will cost an additional $5-$7 million annually in fuel costs and will require a one-time capital investment needed to equip the plant. We are currently preparing preliminary designs with cost estimates for the capital investment requirement.

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

Should you have further questions about the Capitol Power Plant or any of AOC's activities, please do not hesitate to contact me at 228–1793.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN T. AYERS, AIA,
Acting Architect of the Capitol.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WEINER. I'm a big fan of Mr. WHITFIELD, but he misses the big thing here; and that is that we're in the portion of this budget where the legislative branch is funded. Isn't this the opportunity to end the funding for the health care plans that so many Members of Congress get? So many Members of Congress get health care plans, like the 9 million Federal employees and their workers where they get a booklet twice a year with different choices. And since there's so many workers, they are aggregated together to be able to hold down costs for all of them. This is exactly what the new health care plan that is going into effect for the American people seeks to do.

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

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

I mean, the problem here is that if you think about what is going on, with all of the debate about health care and the Big Government-run health care plan, it's really not that. It's really taking the number of uninsured people, giving them subsidies and incentives to go out and get private insurance. And then, since more people are going to have it, all of our costs come down. The aggregation that goes on in insurance markets, the automobile insurance, for example, and Members of Congress take advantage of that.

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

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

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

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

There was even a member of the New York delegation, when asked about it, Are you going to take the government

health care plan since you campaigned so hard against it? And he said, Of course. What happens if I have an accident and I need health care? Where am I going to get it? Exactly.

The same is true for a citizen who works hard. And, by the way, of the uninsured, 75 percent of them have full-time jobs. It's not like they are slacking. They are hardworking Americans. And so the health care plan that we provided, like the Members of Congress, their staffs, and 9 million Federal employees have, says, you know what, the more of us are covered, the more we can control costs just like what the health care plan does.

And here it is, the moment has arrived in the bill, and the silence is deafening. You could probably save a few shekels doing that. Couldn't you, Mr. HONDA? You could probably save a few dollars if you eliminated that. Maybe this is the time to do it. And instead, we are going to hear about an amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The gentleman purports that this amendment cuts energy reduction programs when in actuality that is not what his amendment does. He makes a general cut that will affect office budgets and the services of the House.

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

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

Furthermore, consolidating Member office computer services has dramatically saved energy and taxpayer money. This project has already saved taxpayers over $1 million and is projected to save nearly $800,000 annually, returning back to us a return on investment.

All told, energy reduction programs for the House have already saved taxpayers $3.2 million and is projected to save nearly $9 million annually once it is completed.

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

Let's stop the message amendments and work towards real deficit reduction.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1902. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''House of Representatives, House Leadership Offices'' shall be $24,861,969, and the levels under that heading shall be as follows:

(1) For the Office of the Speaker, $4,877,851.

(2) For the Office of the Majority Floor Leader, $2,432,808.

(3) For the Office of the Minority Floor Leader, $4,378,238.

(4) For the Office of the Majority Whip, $2,105,373.

(5) For the Office of the Minority Whip, $1,628,873.

(6) For the Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities, $497,619.

(7) For the Republican Steering Committee, $940,674.

(8) For the Republican Conference, $1,679,970.

(9) For the Republican Policy Committee, $344,485.

(10) For the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee, $1,319,273.

(11) For the Democratic Caucus, $1,659,696.

(12) For nine minority employees, $1,487,455.

(13) For the training and program development—majority, $277,807.

(14) For the training and program development—minority, $277,439.

(15) For Cloakroom Personnel—majority, $477,469.

(16) For Cloakroom Personnel—minority, $476,939.

SEC. 1903. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''House of Representatives, Members' Representational Allowances'' shall be $613,052,000.

SEC. 1904. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''House of Representatives, Committee Employees, Standing Committees, Special and Select'' shall be $132,449,103, the period of applicability referred to in the proviso under that heading shall be December 31, 2012, and none of the funds made available under that heading may be used for committee room upgrading.

SEC. 1905. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''House of Representatives, Committee on Appropriations'' shall be $28,483,000, and the period of applicability referred to in the proviso under that heading shall be December 31, 2012.

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

(1) for the Office of the Clerk shall be $26,568,000;

(2) for the Office of the Sergeant at Arms shall be $8,221,000; and

(3) for the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer shall be $121,676,000.

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

(1) for employee tuition assistance benefit payments shall be $0;

(2) for employee child care benefit payments shall be $0;

(3) for Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery shall be $17,000,000, of which $5,000,000 shall remain available until expended;

(4) for the Wounded Warrior Program shall be $2,000,000; and

(5) for Energy Demonstration Projects shall be $0.

SEC. 1908. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Joint Items, Joint Economic Committee'' shall be $4,364,500.

SEC. 1909. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Joint Items, Joint Committee on Taxation'' shall be $10,551,150.

SEC. 1910. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Capitol Police, Salaries'' shall be $277,688,000.

SEC. 1911. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Office of Compliance, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $4,085,150.

SEC. 1912. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Congressional Budget Office, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $42,761,000.

SEC. 1913. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), notwithstanding section 1101, the level and period of availability for each item under the heading ''Architect of the Capitol''

shall be determined in accordance with an allocation plan submitted by the Architect of the Capitol and approved by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate, except that—

(1) the aggregate level for all items under that heading may not exceed $498,491,000; and

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

(b) Subsection (a) does not apply to ''Architect of the Capitol, Senate Office Buildings''.

SEC. 1914. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Library of Congress, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $417,189,000, the amount applicable under the fourth proviso under that heading shall be $4,815,000, and the amount applicable under the fifth and seventh provisos under that heading shall be $0.

SEC. 1915. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Library of Congress, Copyright Office, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $52,914,670, of which not more than $33,751,000, to remain available until expended, shall be derived from collections credited to such appropriation during fiscal year 2011 under section 708(d) of title 17, United States Code, and the amount applicable under the third proviso under such heading shall be $34,612,000.

SEC. 1916. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $107,309,000.

SEC. 1917. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Library of Congress, Books for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $66,124,000.

SEC. 1918. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Government Printing Office, Government Printing Office Revolving Fund'' shall be $1,659,000.

SEC. 1919. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Government Printing Office, Office of Superintendent of Documents, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $39,911,000.

SEC. 1920. (a) Section 309(c) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1999 (44 U.S.C. 305 note) is amended by striking paragraph (5).

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

SEC. 1921. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Government Accountability Office, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $522,823,000, the amount applicable under the first proviso under that heading shall be $9,400,000, the amount applicable under the second proviso under that heading shall be $3,100,000, and the amount applicable under the third proviso under that heading shall be $7,000,000.

SEC. 1922. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Open World Leadership Center Trust Fund'' shall be $5,100,000.

SEC. 1923. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development'' shall be $0.

□ 0120

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE X—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES

SEC. 2001. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts of the Department of Defense, excluding funds designated by section 1110 of this division, shall be as follows: ''Military Construction, Army'', $3,904,998,000; ''Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps'', $3,516,173,000; ''Military Construction, Air Force'', $1,214,295,000; and ''Military Construction, Defense-Wide'', $2,964,062,000.

SEC. 2002. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts of the Department of Defense shall be as follows: ''Military Construction, Army National Guard'', $873,664,000; ''Military Construction, Air National Guard'', $194,986,000; ''Military Construction, Army Reserve'', $318,175,000; ''Military Construction, Navy Reserve'', $61,557,000; and ''Military Construction, Air Force Reserve'', $7,832,000.

SEC. 2003. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts of the Department of Defense shall be as follows: ''Family Housing Construction, Army'', $92,369,000; ''Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps'', $186,444,000; ''Family Housing Construction, Air Force'', $78,025,000; ''Family Housing Construction, Defense-Wide'', $0; and ''Family Housing Improvement Fund'', $1,096,000.

SEC. 2004. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts of the Department of Defense shall be as follows: ''North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program'', $258,884,000; ''Homeowners Assistance Fund'', $16,515,000; ''Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense-Wide'', $124,971,000; ''Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990'', $360,474,000; and ''Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005'', $2,354,285,000.

SEC. 2005. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts of the Department of Defense shall be as follows: ''Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $518,140,000; ''Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps'', $366,346,000; ''Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $513,792,000; and ''Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $50,464,000.

SEC. 2006. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the following provisions included in title I of division E of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds made available by this division: the first, second, and last provisos, and the set-aside of $350,000,000, under the heading ''Military Construction, Army''; the first and last provisos under the heading ''Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps''; the first, second, and last provisos under the heading ''Military Construction, Air Force''; the second, third, fourth, and last provisos under the heading ''Military Construction, Defense-Wide'', the first, second and last provisos, and the set-aside of $30,000,000, under the heading ''Military Construction, Army National Guard''; the first, second, and last provisos, and the set-aside of $30,000,000, under the heading ''Military Construction, Air National Guard''; the first, second, and last provisos, and the set-aside of $30,000,000, under the heading ''Military Construction, Army Reserve''; the first, second, and last provisos, the set-aside of $20,000,000, and the set-aside of $35,000,000, under the heading ''Military Construction, Navy Reserve''; the first, second, and last provisos, and the set-aside of $55,000,000, under the heading ''Military Construction, Air Force Reserve''; the proviso under the heading ''Family Construction, Army''; the proviso under the heading ''Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps''; the proviso under the heading ''Family Housing Construction , Air Force''; the proviso under the heading ''Family Housing Construction, Defense-Wide''; and the proviso under the heading ''Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense-Wide''.

SEC. 2007. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Veterans Affairs, Departmental Administration, General Operating Expenses'' shall be $2,546,276,000, of which not less than $2,148,776,000 shall be for the Veterans Benefits Administration.

SEC. 2008. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Veterans Affairs, Departmental Administration, Information Technology Systems'' shall be $3,146,898,000.

SEC. 2009. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Veterans Affairs, Departmental Administration, Construction, Major Projects'' shall be $1,151,036,000: *Provided*, That not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a spending plan for fiscal year 2011 at a level of detail below the account level: *Provided further*, That the last proviso included in title I of division E of Public Law 111–117 under the heading ''Department of Veterans Affairs, Departmental Administration, Construction, Major Projects'' shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 2010. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Veterans Affairs, Departmental Administration, Construction, Minor Projects'' shall be $467,700,000.

SEC. 2011. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Veterans Affairs, Departmental Administration, Grants for Construction of State Extended Care Facilities'' shall be $85,000,000.

SEC. 2012. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Armed Forces Retirement Home, Trust Fund'' shall be $71,200,000, of which $2,000,000 shall be for construction and renovation of physical plants.

SEC. 2013. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the following provisions included in title IV of division E of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division: the proviso under ''Military Construction, Army'' and the proviso under ''Military Construction, Air Force''.

SEC. 2014. Of the funds made available for ''Military Construction, Defense-Wide'' in title I of division E of Public Law 110–329, $23,000,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 2015. Of the funds made available for ''Military Construction, Defense-Wide'' in title I of division E of Public Law 111–117, $125,500,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 2016. Of the funds made available for ''Military Construction, Army'' in title I of division E of Public Law 111–117, $160,000,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 2017. Of the funds made available for ''Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps'' in title I of division E of Public Law 111–117, $34,000,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 2018. Of the funds made available for ''Military Construction, Air Force'' in title I of division E of Public Law 111–117, $87,000,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 2019. Of the unobligated balances available for ''Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005'' from prior appropriations (other than appropriations designated by law as being for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism or as an emergency requirement), $200,000,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 2020. Of the funds designated by section 1110 of this division, funds available for the Department of Defense shall be as follows: ''Military Construction, Army'', $929,994,000; ''Military Construction, Air Force'', $280,506,000; and ''Military Construction, Defense-Wide'', $46,500,000.

SEC. 2021. The levels for each of the following accounts for fiscal year 2012 shall be as follows:

(1) ''Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical Services'', $39,649,985,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2011, and shall remain available until September 30, 2012.

(2) ''Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical Support and Compliance'', $5,535,000,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2011, and shall remain available until September 30, 2012.

(3) ''Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical Facilities'' in the amount of $5,426,000,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2011, and shall remain available until September 30, 2012.

SEC. 2022. Of the amounts appropriated to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2011 for ''Medical services'', ''Medical support and compliance'', ''Medical facilities'', ''Construction, minor projects'', and ''Information technology systems'', up to $235,360,000, plus reimbursements, may be transferred to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund, established by section 1704 of title XVII of division A of Public Law 111–84 and may be used for operation of the facilities designated as a combined Federal medical facility as described by section 706 of Public Law 110–417: *Provided*, That additional funds may be transferred from accounts designated in this section to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund upon written notification by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

SEC. 2023. Such sums as may be deposited to the Medical Care Collections Fund pursuant to section 1729A of title 38, United States Code, for health care provided at facilities designated as a combined Federal medical facility as described by section 706 of Public Law 110–417 shall also be available: (1) for transfer to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund, established by section 1704 of Public Law 111–84, and (2) for operations of the facilities designated as a combined Federal medical facility as described by section 706 of Public Law 110–417.

SEC. 2024. Of the funds made available for ''Department of Veterans Affairs, Departmental Administration, Information technology systems'' in division E of Public Law 111–117, $117,000,000 is rescinded.

Mr. CRENSHAW (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 319, line 25, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE XI—STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS

SEC. 2101. For purposes of this title, the term ''division F of Public Law 111–117'' means the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2010 (division F of Public Law 111–117).

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

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

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

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

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

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

First, the Republican leadership announced a plan to make $44 billion in cuts. Then we started hearing other numbers: $58 billion, $74 billion, $100 billion. Each time it is measured a different way by a different baseline. And no matter how high the number goes, there are proposals to cut even deeper.

These numbers weren't chosen because they looked at programs and said, Here is something that is not working, or, Here is something we don't need to do. No, the number was purely arbitrary, plucked out of a hat, totally unrelated to any thoughtful calculation of what was actually needed and how much that cost.

This bill isn't about making government more cost effective or more efficient. It doesn't promote the kinds of reforms and streamlining that are needed to ensure that our aid reaches those who need it most. It is simply a slash-and-burn process, hacking away with a machete without consideration for all the critically important work that is being destroyed or how it affects our national security.

The base bill itself might be laughable if it weren't so appalling. Humanitarian programs to provide lifesaving assistance, food, water, medicine and plastic sheeting to victims of earthquakes, hurricanes, floods and famines is cut by 50 percent. Do we really intend to stand idly by as innocent men, women, and children starve to death? Will we turn off our television sets when we see people's homes and livelihoods wiped away by an unexpected catastrophe?

It is not just disaster aid that is affected. Every other program that protects the poorest and most vulnerable people is savaged: refugee aid, food aid, water and sanitation, massive cuts in international efforts to fight AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis.

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

Over the last month, we have all watched the incredible events unfolding in Tunisia and Egypt. The United States did not create these democracy movements and does not control them. But our diplomats did and do play a large role in helping to promote peaceful, negotiated solutions so that the will of the people can be heard.

Our security assistance helped professionalize forces in both of those countries so they did not crush the demonstrators with force, as has happened in so many other places. And yet this bill and many of the proposed amendments would slash the kinds of assistance we provide nascent democracy movements and human rights activists under other authoritarian regimes.

Somehow, the draconian cuts in this bill were not enough for many in this body. Added on top of all these cuts, we now face amendments to remove ourselves completely from the United Nations, to eliminate funding for the National Endowment for Democracy and the Millennium Challenge Corporation and the U.S. Institute of Peace. They would prohibit us from taking action to address climate change and increase the availability of voluntary family planning for couples who cannot feed the children they already have. They would cut aid to countries whose support is essential to us in the areas of counterterrorism, intelligence and nonproliferation just because they don't vote with us in the United Nations.

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

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

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

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

Tough measures we authored to hold accountable recipients of U.S. assistance in Afghanistan are also preserved in this bill to ensure that taxpayer dollars are spent efficiently and effectively to achieve our security priorities in the region. However, irresponsible cuts in policies in the CR will threaten global stability and American interests abroad.

There is broad bipartisan agreement that a three-legged stool of defense, diplomacy and development is vital to our national security, yet this bill would dramatically weaken U.S. diplomacy and development.

□ 0130

Despite the ongoing events in Egypt, burgeoning protests throughout the region, instability around the world, this bill undermines our efforts aimed at democratic governance and alternative development options, our support of international financial institutions, conflict mitigation and reconciliation, disaster assistance, and global health priorities.

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

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

Finally, these measures are brought to the floor under the guise of fiscal responsibility. Let me be clear: This bill would endanger our national and economic security, hurt job growth, and put an extreme social agenda ahead of restoring our economy. So I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

In this environment where we have a potential game-changing situation in the Arab world, where people not only in the Arab world but around the entire globe have celebrated as people have taken to the streets to reclaim the right to shape their own government, to exercise their God-given rights of freedom of expression, freedom of association, in this hour of great promise and hour of great peril, our ability to interact with the rest of the world, our ability to fund vital efforts in the rest of the world is more essential than ever.

We have an opportunity here to help in parts of the world that have been fertile terrain for terrorism to remove some of the root causes of that terrorism—the lack of opportunity, suffering under authoritarian regimes—and we need to engage in this potentially new world.

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

To give you one example, right now Egypt is under military law. We have a decades-long relationship with the Egyptian military by virtue of our FMF funding, by virtue of our IMET relationship. These are the subject of not only cuts but, in some of the amendments tonight, crippling cuts that will undermine our continuing ability, our continuing relationship with that military as it works with members of the opposition to shape Egypt's future. That relationship we have with the Egyptian military I think will be pivotal in keeping a fire lit in Egypt to make sure that the road to democracy is inexorable and that it happens soon. So I am desperately concerned about some of the cuts in the CR and some of the cuts that are contemplated in the amendments.

I appreciate very much the work that my chair, NITA LOWEY, has done and the new chair, Ms. GRANGER, has done. I look forward to working with both of them. I hope to restore some of the funding that has been taken out in the CR and to defeat some of the amendments that will further undercut these vital international efforts.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

We are taking our pledge to cut spending seriously. Since fiscal year 2008, the state-foreign operations budget has had dramatic increases, and this bill begins to rein in the growth of many programs.

The state-foreign operations title of the bill before us is $44.9 billion. This represents—an $11.7 billion, or 21%, reduction from the president's fiscal year 2011 request; A $3.8 billion, or 8%, reduction from the fiscal year 2010 enacted level, and A $9.9 billion, or 18%, reduction from the fiscal year 2010 level with supplemental appropriations.

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

To achieve the level of savings included for the remainder of FY11, reductions were made in areas that, while difficult, preserve important efforts and priorities. For example, the bill before us supports top national security priorities, maintains momentum in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan, fully funds the US-Israel memorandum of understanding at $3 billion, and continues the fight against illegal drug trafficking in Mexico, Central America, and Colombia.

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

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

Many programs that are well-liked and supported are scaled back. Our country simply cannot afford the growth some of these programs have experienced since 2008.

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

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

While these choices were difficult, they must be made in order to preserve our national security priorities.

There is a need for continued oversight in our foreign aid and constituents want to be assured that their tax dollars are being used as

intended and not falling into the wrong hands. For that reason I have included language which provides additional oversight for countries like Afghanistan and Lebanon.

I would like to thank ranking member LOWEY for her dedication to the subcommittee as chair for the last four years, and I look forward to continuing to work together.

We both agree that members on both sides of the aisle deserve to be heard on the important foreign policy matters that come before our subcommittee. We have members who are returning this year to the subcommittee and new members who are ready to be a part of our team.

I would also like to thank the staff on both sides. On the majority staff Anne Marie Chotvacs, Craig Higgins, Alice Hogans, Susan Adams, Celia Alvarado, and Jamie Guinn. On the minority staff: Steve Marchese.

I know Mrs. LOWEY and I both appreciate the work of our personal office staff: Aaron Ranck, Johnnie Kaberle, and Talia Dubovi.

I also want to recognize Jeff Shockey. This will be the last appropriations bill on the floor before Jeff leaves the appropriations committee so I want take this opportunity to thank him for his years of dedication and hard work. Jeff has been a significant asset to this committee, and to the house, and he will be missed.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2102. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: ''Administration of Foreign Affairs, Diplomatic and Consular Programs'', $8,383,460,000, of which $1,491,041,000 is for Worldwide Security Protection (to be available until expended); ''Administration of Foreign Affairs, Office of Inspector General'', $94,000,000; ''Administration of Foreign Affairs, Capital Investment Fund'', $59,575,000; ''Administration of Foreign Affairs, Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service'', $9,400,000; ''Administration of Foreign Affairs, Representation Allowances'', $7,685,000; ''Administration of Foreign Affairs, Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan'', $19,904,000; ''Administration of Foreign Affairs, Civilian Stabilization Initiative'', $40,000,000; and ''Administration of Foreign Affairs, Protection of Foreign Missions and Officials'', $26,320,000.

SEC. 2103. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: ''International Organizations, Contributions to International Organizations'', $1,516,430,000; ''International Organizations, Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities'', $1,898,511,000; ''Related Programs, United States Institute of Peace'', $42,676,000, which shall not be used for construction activities; ''Related Programs, East-West Center'', $10,716,000; and ''International Commissions, International Fisheries Commissions'', $44,627,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

Page 359, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $42,676,000)''.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This is a very, very good program. But should we be spending $100 million of taxpayer money to build a think tank, a giant headquarters a stone's throw from the State Department? Should we be providing them money through grants from the Department of Defense or State Department? Maybe. They get those, too. But they get a direct congressional earmark that was dropped in in 1985 and hasn't had a single oversight hearing since.

It's a good program. It does worthy things. I got a copy of the talking points of the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), one of my absolute heroes in this place, and it lists some of those great things they do. But the question has to be: In these fiscal times, is there nothing that we should be able to say, you know, maybe we should do without? Or, better yet, if you believe that giving an additional $40 million, let it go out in the form of grants. Let other institutes step up and try to get it. Let them apply. Let them make an application.

This is a moment that we progressives have to embrace. There's a lot of waste. They didn't get a lot of it, the other side of the aisle. And I think that we should be looking for opportunities to say maybe we can do things a little bit differently.

Let's remember how this got here, by the way. This got here when former Senator Stevens put a $100 million earmark in the bill in conference. It wasn't voted on here, wasn't voted on the Senate, and it plopped in. We deride those things all the time, and yet here it is, this glorious building. This building is remarkable. And I'll give you more. Apparently, Navy Hill, which is right nearby, the Defense Department is giving them some land there, too.

□ 0140

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEINER. If we are going to engage in a debate and if you will yield on your time, I gladly will.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I would be happy to.

Mr. WEINER. Yes, I will gladly yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. General Petraeus has written a letter indicating that the Institute of Peace is an integral part of resolving conflict and mediation on the ground.

I hope the gentleman will comment on that.

Mr. WEINER. Yes, certainly. He's right.

The question is not that but, rather, where in General Petraeus' letter did he say we should be funding it with a direct congressional earmark. No one says stop functioning. I want this building to be filled up with happy, peace-loving activists who are doing their job. I hope they do.

The question is very simple, I say to my colleague from Illinois, one of the foremost leaders of this House:

Why do we choose this particular think tank to bestow this direct congressional line item? I'm amenable to taking the $42 million and saying, let's see if they can use it at Cornell or the University of Illinois' Peace Institute or at the Cato Institute or—I was going to say a more conservative one just to mix it up a little bit.

The point that I'm making is, it's just why it has this status in the budget. It shouldn't. It had it once. It keeps it. It keeps it. It keeps it. It keeps it. Look at this. Have you been to the State Department recently? It doesn't look this good. Have you been to the Pentagon recently? It doesn't look this good. I mean, this is pretty darned good, and it's $100 million of U.S. taxpayer dollars. Go out and raise it like every other think tank.

General Petraeus is right. Let's keep the United States Institute of Peace, but let's stop paying for it in this way.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Chair, Congress created the U.S. Institute of Peace in 1984 as part of the Defense Authorization Act of 1985. Since that time, USIP has been active on the ground in diverse conflict zones around the world, among them the Balkans, Afghanistan, Colombia, Iraq, Kashmir, Liberia, Nepal, Pakistan, the Palestinian Territories, Nigeria, Sudan, Uganda, and the Philippines.

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

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

Former Secretary of State George Schultz, in a February 15, 2011, letter to the institute's President, echoed the comments of General Petraeus by saying:

''We are in the most profound period of change in international affairs since the end of the Cold War; and the institute, as a small and agile operation, has demonstrated a unique capacity to innovate in approaches to managing conflicts abroad that affect U.S. interests.''

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Chair, the U.S. Government simply must have options for solving international conflict other than military action or international diplomacy. USIP is the only independent U.S. Government actor that is dedicated solely to conflict mediation and resolution.

For example, in both Afghanistan and Iraq, USIP has been on the ground since the beginning of these conflicts, actively bringing together parties to the conflict and building an agenda for the resolution of these conflicts, resulting in less need for American troops and paving the way for stabilization efforts. General Petraeus called USIP's reconciliation work in Iraq ''a striking success.''

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

A joint program with the U.S. Army Combined Arms Center in Fort Leavenworth to convene multiple U.S. agencies and extract key lessons from the U.S. military to civilian transition in Iraq to help those confronting another massive handoff in Afghanistan.

Comprehensive training for the U.S. Department of Defense's Ministry of Advisors Program, MoDA, going out to serve in Afghanistan for Lieutenant General William B. Caldwell, IV, commander of NATO Training Command Afghanistan.

USIP, Madam Chair, is a small, agile center of innovation in support of America's national security. Funding for it, obviously, should not be eliminated today.

I want to draw from a letter that General Petraeus, the General of the United States Army Commanding Forces in Afghanistan, most recently wrote to Rob Goldberg, the Director of International Affairs at NSP.

He says—and I extrapolate—''USIP's experience working closely with the U.S. military will be a great asset in developing stronger unity of effort between civilian and military elements of government. In fact, I hope soon to see U.S. military officers training alongside civilian governmental and nongovernmental counterparts in USIP's headquarters at 23rd and Constitution,'' the wonderful building that my colleague Mr. WEINER, one of the foremost leaders of this institution, pointed out to us just moments ago.

''Their facility is not just an important symbol of our Nation's commitment to peace; it is also home to a wonderful training center that we hope to leverage to increase understanding and unity of effort in today's complex operations.''

The USIP is across the street, or just across the river, from the Pentagon, therefore giving access to our military leaders who are fighting abroad.

Mr. WEINER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WEINER. The gentleman correctly points out some of the great things they're doing on behalf of the Department of Defense.

Is the gentleman aware that the United States Institute of Peace gets, in addition to the money that I've identified here, $135 million in transfer from DOD, USAID and the State Department? Is the gentleman aware that they already get grants to do that work and that the money that I am seeking to cut is above and beyond that work? Is the gentleman aware of that?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I thank the gentleman for engaging in the debate.

UNITED STATES CENTRAL COMMAND,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDER,
MacDill Air Force Base, FL, Feb. 11, 2009.

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

DEAR MR. GOLDBERG, I would like to underscore the importance of the US Institute for Peace (USIP) to the missions the United States is currently pursuing in Iraq and Afghanistan. While I have long been an avid reader of USIP's analytical products, which are second to none in tracking the challenges we face in both countries and in outlining policy options, I have more recently been impressed with USIP's on-the-ground peacebuilding efforts.

In Iraq, the Institute stepped up to the plate beginning in August 2007 to assist the 10th Mountain Division in a reconciliation effort in Mahmoudiya, a community on the southern edge of Baghdad that was once known as the ''Triangle of Death.'' Since then, General Odierno and I have often cited Mahmoudiya as a striking success story. USIP's continuing reconciliation efforts at the community level, especially in Diyala and Ninewa, as well as at the national level in Baghdad, hold great promise for the future.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

DAVID H. PETRAEUS,
General, United States Army, Commanding.

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

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

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

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

□ 0150

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

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

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

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

I am proud to note that this amendment is supported by Citizens Against Government Waste, a nonpartisan group whose mission is to eliminate waste, mismanagement, and inefficiency in the Federal Government. They know an unnecessary program when they see it.

For example, in the building for the Institute of Peace—and this is from their Web site—there will be a contemplation area that will provide a quiet, meditative setting where visitors can reflect on their journey through the Global Peacebuilding Center. Enveloped in a spare, yet evocative, space combining a soothing water element with a generous gathering area, visitors will be encouraged to take time to consider the meaning of their recent experience. Preliminary thoughts for the water feature suggest a piece of cantilevered, honed slate across which flows a thin sheet of water that spills off the table into a pool below.

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

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

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

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

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

Would the gentleman please comment for us on the difference between diplomacy at the State Department and peace? Peace is not the responsibility of the State Department.

Mr. WEINER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Diplomacy is the responsibility of the State Department.

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

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

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

That's the only question. The idea there's only one—maybe Mr. CHAFFETZ can speak to this. The idea there's only one think tank pursuing peaceful outcomes, I believe, Mr. JACKSON, you know that that's not the case.

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

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Reclaiming my time, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Chairman, I plan to vote against this amendment.

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

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

□ 0200

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

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

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

I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. WEINER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WEINER. I just want to make sure that it's clear what we're saying. I don't think anyone who supports this amendment believes they should cease to exist. You can go to their Web site. They also have the benefit of being a beneficiary of private funds that they raise in large amounts. They can raise money to continue their work. And it was Mr. JACKSON who suggested that somehow no one else can do this work. The State Department has an Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction Stabilization. The Defense Department has an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. These functions exist within the agencies. No one is saying it should not exist. It should exist, just not in this way.

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

Mr. WEINER. You've got to understand, in the context of this CR, we have a binary choice: fund/don't fund. I agree, I would like there to be oversight since 1985 over this and to answer this question. To be very clear, you are not entirely correct. The money and the authorization to build the building came in the form of an earmark, a drop of $100 million by Senator Stevens that came from neither House, from neither committee. It just fell in there. And that was to build that building. We are catching up $780 million in.

Mr. BERMAN. If retroactively you could undo the money that was spent to build the building, make that argument. You are right now trying to zero out the appropriation for the programs of an institute that Congress created through legislation passed in both Houses. Put in a bill to repeal the legislation, and then we will go through the arguments about its merits or not and decide. Don't wipe it out through this indirect fashion. If you put in legislation, the authorizing committees will consider that legislation. This isn't the right way to do it.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

The Cooperation for Peace and Unity organization, resolve longstanding conflicts on Pashtun Sunnis over disputed grazing wetlands, report back to their respective community stakeholders on peaceful approaches to resolve their disputes.

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

These, dear colleagues, are in-country. The same thing that the Institute of Peace does.

Now, the bottom line for this is we are $14.1 trillion in debt. We are selling

our children's futures away. The only reason I am standing here today as a Member of Congress is because I'm a father on a mission to restore the fiscal responsibility of this great body. And this is one organization that we can do without.

Mr. WEINER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

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

The gentleman from Minnesota is exactly right, that there are institutions that do this. According to—this was just a very cursory search. 151 peace study programs are underway now in colleges around the United States. Just maybe one of them can do this as well. Maybe the competition will help some. Maybe a couple of them can work together to maybe figure out ways to do this same work. The presumption that we have here on this floor, that there's something magical about the U.S. Institute of Peace's ability to do it, is what the gentleman from Minnesota is referring to. I even heard that introduced in evidence. And if I went to the transcripts since 1985 of oversight hearings, I would have very little reading to do because we didn't have any. So what we're really relying upon is the benevolence of this organization to say, If you give us more than the $780 million we've gotten, we'll do good things with it.

The gentleman is exactly right.

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 248 OFFERED BY MR. CANSECO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 0210

Erskine Bowles, President Clinton's former Chief of Staff and cochair of President Obama's Deficit Commission, has said, ''This debt is like a cancer. It is truly going to destroy the country from within.''

Just how bad is our fiscal situation? Well, I've just run two back-to-back trillion dollar-plus deficits, and we are on track to run a third one. We're spending at levels as a share of the economy not seen since World War II. We are borrowing 40 cents on the dollar, driving our already $14 trillion in debt even higher.

Cutting spending is the solution to putting our budget back on a sustainable fiscal path. However, my friends on the other side of the aisle would have you believe that we do not have to cut spending. This just isn't the case. However, you don't have to take my word for it.

In his written testimony from his recent appearance in front of the House Budget Committee, Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke said, ''One way or another, fiscal adjustments sufficient to stabilize the Federal budget must occur at some point. The question is whether these adjustments will take place through a careful and deliberative process or whether the needed fiscal adjustments will come as a rapid and painful response to a looming or actual fiscal crisis.''

No doubt we are making tough decisions here today to begin putting our budget back on a sustainable fiscal path. Yet, as painful as some of these decisions are, it will be more painful for our children and grandchildren if we do not get our fiscal house in order. Failing to do so will mean that we will be the first generation to leave the next with less opportunity and less liberty. Is that the legacy we want to leave our children and grandchildren? I think not.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

While I will agree that we need to cut the Federal budget, I do not believe we

should carelessly use a machete, a samurai sword or a sledgehammer to discard programs that are necessary to protecting U.S. interests in this region of the world. The East-West Center was established by Federal law of the U.S. Congress in 1960. President Eisenhower signed the Mutual Security Act of 1960 which authorized its creation only after the State Department conducted a study and reported back to Congress about the relevance of establishing the East-West Center.

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

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

Our trade and commercial relations with the Asia Pacific region are critical to our own economic interests in this important region.

Since the East-West Center is not solely funded by the Federal Government but also receives the majority of its funding from private agencies, individuals, foundations, and corporations, I agree that the Federal support can be scaled back, and this has already been done by the committee's mark of 50 percent deductions at the urging of this institution.

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

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

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

I respectfully request that these amendments not be approved.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2104. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: ''International Commissions, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, Salaries and Expenses'', $43,419,000; ''International Commissions, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, Construction'', $25,286,000; ''International Commissions, American Sections'', $11,852,000; ''Related Programs, The Asia Foundation'', $14,749,000; ''Other Commissions, Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad, Salaries and Expenses'', $597,000; ''Other Commissions, United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, Salaries and Expenses'', $4,042,000; ''Other Commissions, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Salaries and Expenses'', $2,453,000; ''Other Commissions, Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China, Salaries and Expenses'', $1,880,000; and ''Other Commissions, United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission'', $3,290,000.

SEC. 2105. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: ''Related Agency, Broadcasting Board of Governors, International Broadcasting Operations'', $689,761,000; and ''Related Agency, Broadcasting Board of Governors, Broadcasting Capital Improvements'', $6,785,000.

SEC. 2106. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: ''Administration of Foreign Affairs, Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs'', $501,347,000; ''Related Programs, National Endowment for Democracy'', $110,920,000, of which $100,000,000 shall be allocated in the traditional and customary manner, including for the core institutes; ''Bilateral Economic Assistance, Independent Agencies, Inter-American Foundation'', $20,830,000; and ''Bilateral Economic Assistance, Independent Agencies, African Development Foundation'', $29,757,000.

SEC. 2107. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: ''United States Agency for International Development, Funds Appropriated to the President, Operating Expenses'', $1,267,872,000; ''United States Agency for International Development, Funds Appropriated to the President, Civilian Stabilization Initiative'', $7,000,000; ''United States Agency for International Development, Funds Appropriated to the President, Capital Investment Fund'', $120,777,000; and ''United States Agency for International Development, Funds Appropriated to the President, Office of Inspector General'', $43,710,000.

SEC. 2108. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: ''Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Development Assistance'', $1,773,780,000; ''Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia'', $697,134,000; and ''Bilateral Economic Assistance, Independent Agencies, Millennium Challenge Corporation'', $790,000,000.

SEC. 2109. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: ''Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Economic Support Fund'', $5,706,552,000; ''Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Democracy Fund'', $112,800,000; ''Department of the Treasury, International Affairs Technical Assistance'', $20,235,000; and ''Department of the Treasury, Debt Restructuring'', $30,055,000.

□ 0220

AMENDMENT NO. 291 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

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

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

Under this program, the United States, staggering under the biggest peacetime debt in the Nation's history, a debt so large that the United States of America would now be denied entry into the European Union because of our excessive debt, nevertheless is paying down the debts of developing countries if they do restoration and conservation work in their own rainforests. Really?

The deficit this year alone puts an average family of four on the hook for about $20,000 of additional debt that they must repay through their future taxes just as surely as if it appeared on their credit card, and part of that debt will be used to pay down the debt of developing countries if they develop their rainforests.

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I rise to thank the gentleman for offering this amendment, and I am willing to accept the amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2110. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: ''Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, International Disaster Assistance'', $429,739,000; and ''Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Transition Initiatives'', $44,635,000.

SEC. 2111. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: ''Bilateral Economic Assistance, Department of State, Migration and Refugee Assistance'', $1,023,178,000; and ''Bilateral Economic Assistance, Department of State, United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund'', $44,635,000.

SEC. 2112. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Bilateral Economic Assistance, Independent Agencies, Peace Corps'' shall be $330,799,000.

SEC. 2113. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: ''International Security Assistance, Department of State, Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs'', $740,000,000; and ''International Security Assistance, Department of State, Peacekeeping Operations'', $305,000,000.

SEC. 2114. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: ''International Security Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund'', $1,000,000,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 2012, and shall be available to the Secretary of State under the terms and conditions provided for this Fund in Public Law 111–32; and ''International Security Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Foreign Military Financing Program'', $5,385,000,000, of which not less than $3,000,000,000 shall be available for grants only for Israel and $1,300,000,000 shall be available for grants only for Egypt and $300,000,000 shall be available for assistance for Jordan: *Provided*, That the dollar amount in the fourth proviso under the heading ''International Security Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Foreign Military Financing Program'' in division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be deemed to be $789,000,000 for the purpose of applying funds appropriated under such heading by this division.

SEC. 2115. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: ''Multilateral Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, International Organizations and Programs'', $309,897,000; ''Multilateral Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, International Financial Institutions, Global Environment Facility'', $32,020,000; ''Multilateral Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, International Financial Institutions, Contribution to the International Development Association'', $942,305,000; ''Multilateral Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, International Financial Institutions, Contribution to the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund'', $20,127,000; ''Multilateral Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, International Financial Institutions, Contribution to the African Development Fund'', $134,585,000; and ''Multilateral Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, International Financial Institutions, International Fund for Agricultural Development'', $17,926,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. HELLER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 326, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $44,935,065)''.

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

Page 326, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $136,634,225)''.

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

Page 326, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $19,514,825)''.

Page 326, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,599,270)''.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The African Development Fund. The International Fund for Agricultural Development. We can go on and on. International Organization and Programs. International Financial Institutions.

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The amendment would cut funding to the Asian Development Fund, which provides loans and grants to support basic health care, education, infrastructure, and economic development resources to frontline countries such as Pakistan and Afghanistan.

□ 0230

The International Development Association which provides debt relief to

developing countries and is supporting an integrated agricultural initiative to address the global food crisis.

The Global Environment Facility, which provides grants and loans to preserve some of the most vulnerable habitats in the world.

The International Fund For Agricultural Development, which provides grants and loans to the poorest of the poor to support food security programs as a compliment to U.S. Government-funded programs.

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

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

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

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

I urge a no vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition to this amendment.

As my ranking member, Mrs. LOWEY from New York pointed out, the funding for international operations and programs in the CR is already below levels enacted under President Bush. This would cut it further. It means reductions to a fund for victims of torture, the Development Fund For Women, the U.N. Development Program, as well as two that I want to highlight in particular: UNICEF and the Democracy Fund.

Since its founding in 1946, UNICEF has saved more children's lives than any humanitarian organization in the world. UNICEF works in 150 countries, literally saving children's lives, one of the best investments in foreign assistance dollars.

Through global efforts spearheaded by UNICEF, child mortality rates have dropped by a third since 1990. Every year, 8 million children under 5 still perish from preventable causes. The funding contributed to UNICEF is urgently needed to help save these children.

UNICEF reaches more than half of the world's children with inexpensive immunizations against lethal diseases like measles and tetanus. Annually, UNICEF distributes more than 2.6 billion doses of vaccines worth more than $600 million. UNICEF is one of the largest purchasers of anti-malaria bed nets, distributing 19 million of these life-saving nets in 48 countries.

Nearly a third of the funding for UNICEF comes from nongovernmental sources, businesses, and personal and foundation contributions. UNICEF is also a partner with organizations like Rotary International to eradicate polio and Kiwanis International to fight iodine deficiency disorders.

UNICEF plays a critical role as a U.S. partner to help children in humanitarian crises, whether it is an earthquake in Haiti or flooding in Pakistan. It is a lifeline to millions of children caught up in more than 36 humanitarian emergencies worldwide, serving as the coordinating agency for water and sanitation, child protection, nutrition, and education.

The funding for UNICEF extends the reach of the U.S. Government and the American people in saving children from preventable deaths, supporting education, fighting HIV/AIDS, and protecting children from violence, exploitation, and abuse.

It is a high-return investment in children and a critical part of our international assistance that enjoys the ongoing support of the American people. This is just one of the programs that would be dramatically cut.

The Democracy Fund is another that I want to highlight. We have all witnessed the marvel of the Tunisian and Egyptian people who have risen up against brutal dictators in the name of democracy. The next months and years will be crucial as these countries travel the path to democracy. We must be able to fund NGOs and other entities to support the growth of democracy there and help it become rooted.

As the world's oldest democracy, we cannot shirk our responsibility to foster representative government elsewhere, especially when people have taken it upon themselves to cast off the old order.

The Democracy Fund provides resources for innovative projects that support the longstanding bipartisan U.S. foreign policy goals of defending human rights and advancing democratic values. Working through over 110 implementing partners, in 2010 the Democracy Fund supported local groups to promote democracy and human rights.

Just a few examples: In Yemen, an NGO is working through a combination of youth chat radio series, youth leadership trainings, and public roundtables and forums to increase public awareness and understanding of religious freedom and tolerance.

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

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

Without the Democracy Fund, DRL and the State Department would be unable to support efforts to push the Chinese government to more actively disclose food and drug safety information, information that directly affects the well-being of the American public.

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2116. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: ''Export and Investment Assistance, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, Noncredit Account'', $47,115,000; ''Export and Investment Assistance, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, Program Account'', $23,310,000; and ''Export and Investment Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Trade and Development Agency'', $49,992,000.

SEC. 2117. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the amounts included under the heading ''Administration of Foreign Affairs, Embassy Security, Construction and Maintenance'' in division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$824,239,000'' for ''$876,850,000'' in the first paragraph; and by substituting ''$796,462,000'' for ''$847,300,000'' in the second paragraph.

(b) Notwithstanding section 1101, the amounts included under the heading ''Administration of Foreign Affairs, Repatriation Loans Program Account'' in division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$695,000'' for ''$739,000'' in the first paragraph; and by substituting ''$668,000'' for ''$711,000'' in the second paragraph.

(c) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level in the second paragraph under the heading ''Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Development Credit Authority'' shall be $8,084,000.

SEC. 2118. Notwithstanding section 1101, the amounts included under the heading ''Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Global Health and Child Survival'' in division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting in the first paragraph ''$2,149,780,000'' for ''$2,420,000,000''; by substituting in the second paragraph ''$4,845,700,000'' for ''$5,359,000,000'' and ''$600,000,000'' for ''$750,000,000''.

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

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

(b) Of the unobligated balances from funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the Buying Power Maintenance Account, $18,960,000 are rescinded.

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

(d) Of the unobligated balances available for the Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union account, as identified by Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbols 7206/111093, 7207/121093, and 72X1093, $11,700,000 are rescinded.

(e) Of the unobligated balances available for the International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement account, as identified by Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbols, 11X1022, 1106/121022, and 191105/111022, $7,183,000 are rescinded.

SEC. 2121. (a) Notwithstanding section 653(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2413(b)), the President shall transmit to Congress the report required under section 653(a) of that Act with respect to the provision of funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs: *Provided*, That such report shall include a comparison of amounts, by category of assistance, provided or intended to be provided from funds appropriated for fiscal years 2010 and 2011, for each foreign country and international organization.

(b) Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this division, each department, agency or organization funded by this title or by division F of Public Law 111–117 shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations an operating plan for such funds that provides details at the program, project, and activity level: *Provided*, That the report required under subsection (a) shall be considered to have met the requirements of this subsection with respect to funds made available to carry out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act: *Provided further*, That the spending reports required in division F of Public Law 111–117 for assistance for Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, the Caribbean Basin, Lebanon, Mexico, and Central America, and spending reports required for funds appropriated under the headings ''Diplomatic and Consular Programs'', ''Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance'', ''International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement'', ''Civilian Stabilization Initiative'', and ''Peace Corps'' shall be considered to have met the requirements of this subsection.

(c) The reports required under subsection (b) shall not be considered as meeting the notification requirements under section 7015 of division F of Public Law 111–117 or under section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

SEC. 2122. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the dollar amounts under paragraphs (1) through (4) under the heading ''Administration of Foreign Affairs, Diplomatic and Consular Programs'' in division F of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division: *Provided*, That the dollar amounts to be derived from fees collected under paragraph (5)(A) under such heading shall be ''$1,702,904'' and ''$505,000'' respectively: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this division may be used to support the United States Ambassador's Fund for Cultural Preservation.

(b) Division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division under the heading ''Development Assistance'' by substituting ''should'' for ''shall'' each place it appears: *Provided*, That the sixth, seventh and eighth provisos under the heading ''Development Assistance'' in division F of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this title.

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

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

(1) Section 7034(l).

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

(3) In section 7045:

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

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

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

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

(E) Subsection (h).

(4) Section 7070(b).

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

(6) The third proviso under the heading ''Administration of Foreign Affairs, Civilian Stabilization Initiative''.

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

(e)(1) Notwithstanding the proviso in section 7060 in division F of Public Law 111–117, of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, not more than $440,000,000 may be made available for family planning/reproductive health: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs may be made available for the United Nations Population Fund: *Provided further*, That section 7078 of division F of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

(2) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for population planning activities or other population assistance may be made available to any foreign nongovernmental organization that promotes or performs abortion, except in cases of rape or incest or when the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term.

(f) Section 7064(a)(1) and (b) of division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''should'' for ''shall'' each place it appears.

(g) Section 7081 of division F of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division: *Provided*, That the second proviso of section 7081(d) of division F of Public Law 111–117 is repealed.

(h) Section 7042 of division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$552,900,000'' for the dollar amount in subsection (f)(1).

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

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

(c) The second proviso under the heading ''International Security Assistance, Department of State, Peacekeeping Operations'' in division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied by substituting the following: ''*Provided further*, That up to $55,918,000 may be used to pay assessed expenses of international peacekeeping activities in Somalia, except that up to an additional $35,000,000 may be made available for such purpose subject to prior consultation with, and the regular notification procedures of, the Committees on Appropriations:''.

(d) Section 7034(n) of division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by adding at the end before the period the following: '': *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division or any other Act making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs may be used to implement phase 3 of such authority''.

(e) Section 7034(n) of division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by adding at the end before the period the following: '': *Provided*, That not less than $10,000,000 should be

transferred and merged with funds available under the heading 'Related Agency, Broadcasting Board of Governors, International Broadcasting Operations' to carry out the purposes of this subsection''.

(f) Section 7042 of division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting the following for the proviso in subsection (d)(2): '': *Provided*, That funds may not be made available for obligation until the Secretary of State determines and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that funds provided are in the national security interest of the United States and provides the Committees on Appropriations a detailed spending plan.''.

(g) Section 7043 of division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting the following for subsection (b):

''(b) LIMITATION.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in title VI of this division under the heading 'Export-Import Bank of the United States' may be used by the Export-Import Bank of the United States to provide any new financing (including loans, guarantees, other credits, insurance, and reinsurance) to any person that is subject to sanctions under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 5(a) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–172).''.

(h) Sections 7061, 7065, 7071(i), and 7087(a) of division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''should'' for ''shall'' each place it appears.

(i) Section 7071(b) of division F of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''up to $36,500,000 may'' for ''not less than $36,500,000 shall'' in paragraph (2).

□ 0240

AMENDMENT NO. 481 OFFERED BY MR. FRANKS OF ARIZONA

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 334, line 23, insert before the colon the following: ''and that the new Government of Egypt fulfills its commitment to the Egypt-Israel Peace Treaty signed on March 26, 1979, and to freedom of navigation of the Suez Canal''.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I would reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. My amendment calls on the new government of Egypt to fulfill its commitment to the Egypt-Israel Peace Treaty signed on March 26, 1979, and to the freedom of navigation in the Suez Canal.

For over a quarter of a century, Mr. Chairman, Israel and Egypt have chosen to transcend their differences to promote their respective national interests. Through hostile times and dramatic regional and international changes, Egypt and Israel have maintained a steadfast commitment to well-being and the existence of one another.

The United States now calls upon Egypt to maintain their alliance with the State of Israel during these perilous times. Israel has been a beacon of democracy even in the midst of experiencing both foreign state-sponsored and other omnipresent terrorist attacks, all the while being surrounded by those who embrace a radical Islamist agenda and a pledge of jihad against the tiny Jewish State. For this reason, I offer amendment 481. The continuing resolution states that, ''any assistance made available to the government of Egypt shall be provided with the understanding that Egypt will undertake significant economic and democratic reforms.'' Mr. Chairman, the Egypt-Israel Peace Treaty of 1979 is central to fulfilling that commitment.

I also feel it important to express my grave concern about the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt and their stance against preserving a peaceful relationship with Israel. According to its charter, Mr. Chairman, the Muslim Brotherhood seeks to impose Sharia law, restore the Islamic caliphate, and conquer non-Muslim or ''infidel'' states.

Mohamed Badi, the Brotherhood's Supreme Guide, recently pledged the Brotherhood would ''continue to raise the banner of jihad'' against the Jews. He called the Jews the Brotherhood's ''first and foremost enemies.'' Another top Muslim Brotherhood leader, Mohamed Ghanem, said to Iran's Al-Alam Arabic language television network that he believed Egypt should close the Suez Canal to U.S. warships, and ''the people of Egypt should be prepared for war against Israel.'' Mr. Chairman, there are now reports that Iranian ships are passing unimpeded through the Suez Canal this very night.

The Obama administration recently said the Muslim Brotherhood is largely a secular group which has eschewed violence and has decried al Qaeda as a perversion of Islam, and that they have pursued social ends and a betterment of the political order in Egypt, and that there is no overarching agenda, particularly in pursuit of violence. Mr. Chairman, what a preposterous and expressively dangerous statement to make. The terrorist group Hamas is an offshoot of the Muslim Brotherhood, and al Qaeda itself was catalyzed by elements of the Muslim Brotherhood.

Mr. Chairman, I am bewildered by what President Obama has done when he has called for the Muslim Brotherhood to have a ''seat at the table'' in the new Egyptian government. Based on their recent history and the statements from their leadership and from their founding charter, a ''seat at the table'' for the Brotherhood would be a grave threat to any democratic society as well as the Egypt-Israel Peace Treaty and the stability indeed of the entire Middle East.

Mr. Chairman, Israel shares a long and porous border with Egypt, and I cannot express how crucial it is for the new government of Egypt to honor their peace treaty. I call on the U.S. House of Representatives to expect any government of Egypt to do exactly that, and I hope any new government of Egypt will remember that America is watching.

Mr. Chairman, I felt it was important to get these comments on the record on this debate night. However, I'm told that due to clause 2 of rule XXI a point of order will be raised on my amendment. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw it at this time.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

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

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

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, abortion is always coercive for the child in the womb. An unborn baby girl or boy has no say, no right of refusal, no means to protest, no veto power whatsoever concerning a procedure that violently tears that child's body to pieces and effectuates the kill by lethal injection or starvation by RU486. In China, that coercion is extended by brute force to all women. Any mother caught without explicit authorization to give birth is coerced to abort her baby.

Since 1979, Mr. Speaker, brothers and sisters have been illegal in China as part of the barbaric one child per couple policy. For 30 years, the United Nations Population Fund has vigorously supported, funded, defended, promoted, and even celebrated these massive crimes against humanity.

Under Presidents Reagan, Bush I and Bush—and even 1 year under President Clinton—UNFPA was barred from receiving U.S. funding because of their shameful support and co-management of China's forced abortion policy. My concern this morning is an amendment that had been printed in the RECORD but not offered—at least it has not been offered at this setting; I expect we'll see it later—that would compel every American taxpayer to furnish $55 million to the UNFPA, an organization that has unapologetically stood not with oppressed women but with the oppressors of women; an organization that has made the Chinese killing machine more efficacious and lethal; an organization that has systematically whitewashed and defended these crimes against humanity.

The UNFPA is not only an essential part of the planning and training of the Chinese cadres who run this anti-woman, anti-child program, but the UNFPA assists in the implementation of it in several countries as well.

The uncontested facts are these: Any Chinese, Tibetan, or Uyghur mother without a birth-allowed certificate is forced to abort. All unwed moms are compelled to abort. In what can only be described as a ''search and destroy mission,'' disabled children are forcibly aborted as part of a nationwide eugenics program.

Each day, Chinese family planning cadres impose huge ''compensation

fees'' on any woman who lacks permission to give birth or evades detection. Many women have their children on the run. Ruinous fines—from 1 to 10 times the combined annual salaries of both parents, plus jail, torture, property confiscation, loss of employment, loss of educational opportunities, housing, and health care—are all weapons routinely employed by the so-called family planning cadres to ensure compliance with the one child per couple policy.

In denying U.S. funds to the UNFPA in 2008, Deputy Secretary of State John Negroponte wrote, ''China's birth limitation program retains harshly coercive elements in law and practice, including coercive abortion and involuntary sterilization.'' The number two at the State Department said it is illegal in almost all provinces for a single mom to bear a child. The State Department noted that Chinese law is ''the foundation of its coercive policies and practices'' and that the UNFPA comports with and adheres to that Chinese law.

Mr. Chairman, the UNFPA-supported one child per couple policy has led to the worst gender disparity in any nation in all of human history. Where are the missing girls in China? Dead, Mr. Chairman. Murdered because they were female. Systematically destroyed over 30 years by sex-selective abortion. Today, there are as many as 100 million missing girls in China—gendercide, the evil twin of genocide.

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

□ 0250

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In 2009, the department concluded, based on the review of available facts, that the UNFPA does not engage in these activities. We continue to monitor UNFPA's programs. We continue to believe that UNFPA's activities in China do not implicate Kemp-Kasten. As part of our due diligence, the department sent a team to China to review UNFPA's program in June 2010 prior to the UNFPA executive board's renewal of the China Country Program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

The problem with the United Nations Population Fund activities in China is that it strictly adheres to Chinese law.

Chinese law is a one-child-per-couple policy, and it has a direct result in the clinics and in the programs that are run in the approximately 30 counties that UNFPA oversees or has programs in or projects. Each and every one of those adhere to this one-child-per-couple policy. Yes, they may say you can choose to be sterilized or have an IUD insertion, one or the other, but you must have it. It is compulsory. It is involuntary. So they enforce the involuntariness, the compulsory nature, but they may give a choice as to what method a person may be able to follow. That is not voluntary.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

With all due respect to my good friend, this funding of an organization that says that this is a voluntary program must cease, because they give

tangible assistance. I met finally with Pong Peiyon, the woman who ran the program. Yes, I was in Beijing on one of my many human rights trips there. She said to me over and over again in that conversation that the UNFPA is here, and they see no coercion. There is no coercion.

So I thank my friend for yielding. Again, we should direct our moneys to other organizations—to NGOs, to USAID. I would also point out that a dear colleague went on, as well as some Members on the other side of the aisle, about obstetric fistula.

I want to point out to my friends that I got a bill passed in this House back in 2005 that established a fistula repair program for women in the developing world. It passed. It failed over in the Senate, but it passed.

I went to Kent Hill, who was then the administrator of health for USAID. I said to please take this and administratively put it into practice. We now have 35 different programs in 12 countries. Fifteen thousand African and Asian women have had fistula repairs as a direct result of this program.

We need to funnel our money into maternal health care and into other health care interventions that will aid women, especially those who suffer from such terrible things as obstetric fistula.

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

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

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

Mr. NADLER. Let me begin by congratulating the gentleman from New Jersey on his program to repair fistulas, which are a great problem for many women in the developing world.

I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I also want to congratulate my friend for the important work that you're doing with regard to fistula. I've seen it. I know the suffering that women go through, and I thank you for your leadership on this issue.

□ 0300

The hour is late. The gentleman and I have been talking about this issue for many, many years, and I'd be delighted to have a further discussion, but for the purpose of this debate and the purpose of closing the bill for the moment, I just want to close again by making it clear. We oppose China's coercive birth limitation policy, and the facts show that UNFPA does not support or participate in the management of any programs of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization. In fact, UNFPA works to eliminate them, and I think it's important to note, again, that in 150 countries that do not receive bilateral support and family planning we have seen some very, very important work that actually saves women's lives.

So I would like to say to the gentleman, as we are closing this debate, thank you for your good work. We can agree to disagree on this issue, but I think this is such an important program and we have provided such invaluable help to women that I would hope that at some point we could agree on that.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2124. (a) IN GENERAL.—Subsections (b) through (d) of this section shall apply to funds appropriated by this division in lieu of section 7076 of division F of Public Law 111–117.

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

(1) The Government of Afghanistan is—

(A) demonstrating a commitment to reduce corruption and improve governance, including by investigating, prosecuting, and sanctioning or removing corrupt officials from office and to implement financial transparency and accountability measures for government institutions and officials (including the Central Bank);

(B) taking significant steps to facilitate active public participation in governance and oversight; and

(C) taking credible steps to protect the internationally recognized human rights of Afghan women.

(2) There is a unified United States Government anti-corruption strategy for Afghanistan.

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

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

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

(6) A framework and methodology is being utilized to assess national, provincial, local, and sector level fiduciary risks relating to public financial management of United States Government assistance.

(c) ASSISTANCE AND OPERATIONS.—

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

(A) shall be made available, to the maximum extent practicable, in a manner that emphasizes the participation of Afghan women, and directly improves the security, economic and social well-being, and political status, and protects the rights of, Afghan women and girls and complies with sections 7062 and 7063 of division F of Public Law 111–117, including support for the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission, the Afghan Ministry of Women's Affairs, and women-led nongovernmental organizations;

(B) may be made available for a United States contribution to an internationally-managed fund to support the reconciliation with and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration into Afghan society of former combatants who have renounced violence against the Government of Afghanistan: *Provided*, That funds may be made available to support reconciliation and reintegration activities only if—

(i) Afghan women are participating at national, provincial and local levels of government in the design, policy formulation and implementation of the reconciliation or reintegration process, and such process upholds steps taken by the Government of Afghanistan to protect the internationally recognized human rights of Afghan women; and

(ii) such funds will not be used to support any pardon or immunity from prosecution, or any position in the Government of Afghanistan or security forces, for any leader of an armed group responsible for crimes against humanity, war crimes, or other violations of internationally recognized human rights;

(C) may be made available as a United States contribution to the Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund (ARTF) unless the Secretary of State determines and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that the World Bank Monitoring Agent of the ARTF is unable to conduct its financial control and audit responsibilities due to restrictions on security personnel by the Government of Afghanistan; and

(D) may be made available for a United States contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization/International Security Assistance Force Post-Operations Humanitarian Relief Fund.

(2) Funds appropriated under the headings ''Economic Support Fund'' and ''International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement'' by this division that are available for assistance for Afghanistan that provide training for foreign police, judicial, and military personnel shall address, where appropriate, gender-based violence.

(3) The authority contained in section 1102(c) of Public Law 111–32 shall continue in effect during fiscal year 2011 and shall apply as if part of this division.

(4) The Coordinator for Rule of Law at the United States Embassy in Kabul, Afghanistan shall be consulted on the use of all funds appropriated by this division for rule of law programs in Afghanistan.

(5) None of the funds made available by this division may be used by the United States Government to enter into a permanent basing rights agreement between the United States and Afghanistan.

(6) The Secretary of State, after consultation with the USAID Administrator, shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations not later than 45 days after enactment of this division, and prior to the initial obligation of funds for assistance for Afghanistan, a detailed spending plan for such assistance which shall include clear and achievable goals, benchmarks for measuring progress, and expected results: *Provided*, That such plan shall not be considered as meeting the notification requirements under section 7015 of division F of Public Law 111–117 or under

section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(d) OVERSIGHT.—(1) The Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, the Inspector General of the Department of State and the Inspector General of USAID, shall jointly develop and submit to the Committees on Appropriations within 45 days of enactment of this division a coordinated audit and inspection plan of United States assistance for, and civilian operations in, Afghanistan.

(2) Of the funds appropriated by this division under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' for assistance for Afghanistan, $3,000,000 shall be transferred to, and merged with, funds made available under the heading ''Administration of Foreign Affairs, Office of Inspector General'' by this division, for increased oversight of programs in Afghanistan and shall be in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes: *Provided*, That $1,500,000 shall be for the activities of the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction.

(3) Of the funds appropriated by this division under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' for assistance for Afghanistan, $1,500,000 shall be transferred to, and merged with, funds appropriated under the heading ''United States Agency for International Development, Funds Appropriated to the President, Office of Inspector General'' by this division for increased oversight of programs in Afghanistan and shall be in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes.

(e) MODIFICATION TO PRIOR PROVISIONS.—(1) Section 1004(c)(1)(C) of Public Law 111–212 is amended to read as follows:

''(C) taking credible steps to protect the internationally recognized human rights of Afghan women.''.

(2) Section 1004(d)(1) of Public Law 111–212 is amended to read as follows:

''(1) Afghan women are participating at national, provincial, and local levels of government in the design, policy formulation, and implementation of the reconciliation or reintegration process, and such process upholds steps taken by the Government of Afghanistan to protect the internationally recognized human rights of Afghan women; and''.

(3) Section 1004(e)(1) of Public Law 111–212 is amended to read as follows:

''(1) based on information available to the Secretary, the Independent Electoral Commission has no members or other employees who participated in, or helped to cover up, acts of fraud in the 2009 presidential election in Afghanistan, and the Electoral Complaints Commission is a genuinely independent body with all the authorities that were invested in it under Afghan law as of December 31, 2009; and''.

TITLE XII—TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES

SEC. 2201. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, Operations'' shall be $9,523,028,000, of which $4,559,000,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, of which not less than $7,473,299,000 shall be for air traffic organization activities and not less than $1,253,020,000 shall be for aviation regulation and certification activities.

SEC. 2202. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, Facilities and Equipment'' shall be $2,736,203,000, of which $2,226,203,000 shall remain available through September 30, 2013, and of which $470,000,000 shall remain available through September 30, 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 511 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 346, strike line 12 and all that follows through page 348, line 2.

On page 348, strike line 17 and all that follows through page 351, line 17.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, the continuing resolution under consideration today includes very dangerous cuts to key transportation programs. This is exactly the wrong thing to do if we want to reduce unemployment, create jobs, and grow the economy.

In a survey released by the American Public Transportation Association, 80 percent of private sector businesses surveyed indicated that the level of Federal investment in public transportation has a large influence on their business revenue. For example, every $10 million in capital investment in public transportation yields $30 million, three times, in increased business sales. The Texas Transportation Institute's ''2010 Urban Mobility Report'' shows that worsening road congestion across the Nation, $134 billion, $134 billion a year costs in loss productivity. And when it comes to transit alone, every $1 billion invested creates or supports 36,000 jobs.

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

These proposed cuts to transportation include $4.975 billion in high-speed and intercity passenger rail grants; $710 million in transit capital investment grants; $292 million in FHWA surface transportation priorities; $150 million in grants to Amtrak; and $100 million in Federal Rail Administration rail safety technology grants.

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

Unfortunately, the underlying bill cuts transportation funding so dramatically and other funding so dramatically that it is virtually impossible to write an amendment to restore transportation funding to current levels even that would be in order under the rules the House has adopted without causing great harm to other critical programs. This is particularly true since all the transportation funding programs and all the Housing and Urban Development programs which are in this title are underfunded. So it's almost impossible to say let's restore these transportation funds but eliminate other transportation or housing funds.

In fact, this CR is such an irresponsible and reckless document that it is almost not worth trying to fix it. The Republicans have seized on this idea to cut $100 billion from the current budget, pulling that figure arbitrarily out of thin air and without any regard to what it could mean for our economy or the services that it prevents. It is a dangerous overreach that would be devastating for middle- and working class Americans. It would destroy tens, in fact, hundreds of thousands of jobs without replacing them and would threaten national security.

The transportation cuts are a small part of these irresponsible cuts. This amendment is a small part of opposing this dangerous continuing resolution, and I anticipate unfortunately that my amendment is going to be ruled out of order. I hope that's not the case. In a rational House, it would not be the case, but I urge my colleagues to support the amendment if they have the opportunity to do so, and in order to support reasonable transportation funding so as not to decimate this economy. If necessary, I urge them to vote against the entire CR.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman from Iowa continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. LATHAM. I would continue to reserve.

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress, which states:

''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.''

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

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

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

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

□ 0310

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2203. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be $0: ''Department of Transportation, Office of the Secretary, National Infrastructure Investments''; ''Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Surface Transportation Priorities''; ''Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration, Grants for Energy Efficiency and Greenhouse Gas Reductions''; ''Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration, Railroad Safety Technology Program''; ''Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration, Capital Assistance for High Speed Rail Corridors and Intercity Passenger Rail Service''; ''Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, Assistance to Small Shipyards''; and ''Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration, Grants to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority''.

SEC. 2204. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, Research, Engineering, and Development'' shall be $146,828,000.

SEC. 2205. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration, Capital Investment Grants'' shall be $1,569,092,000.

SEC. 2206. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration, Rail Line Relocation and Improvement Program'' shall be $15,000,000.

SEC. 2207. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration, Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation'' shall be $850,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

Page 359, line 22, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $446,900,000)''.

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

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

In 2008, the Pew Charitable Trusts Foundation performed a study of Amtrak's services. According to that study, the 20 most egregiously inefficient train lines run annual deficits between $4.9 million and $59.4 million per year, with many operating at a 100 percent loss. My amendment would decrease the spending authority to Amtrak by the amount equal to those lines' losses.

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

The underlying bill terminates, completely defunds the High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail program that was authorized under the PRIIA rail safety bill in the fall of 2008 and signed by then President Bush. That's 28 months ago. It rescinds those items that were in the Recovery Act. In the legislation that was passed in February of 2009, the Recovery Act, it rescinds all of the unobligated funds from that Recovery Act, and it rescinds in the high-speed rail program the $2.5 billion of grants that were awarded in September of last year that were passed in the December '09 2010 appropriations bill. Those grants were awarded but have not yet been obligated.

It also happens to shut down all of the new funding for light rail and commuter rail and bus rapid transit, only providing money for those projects already in place that have received full funding grant agreements. They have contracts of that sort. There is funding in the underlying legislation to do that in the area of the Federal Transit Administration. It also cancels all of the so-called TIGER grants which were part of the fiscal year 2010 legislation, some $600 million, over 76 projects in 40 different States which were awarded money from among 1,000 projects that asked for $20 billion, showing the enormous need that was perceived on the part of the country. All of that in the TIGER grants in the 2010 budget are matched by local funds. It's not all Federal funds, as were the ARRA moneys. But it has to be matched at the local level. It's not cookie cutter. It is not ordered by Beltway bureaucrats or anything like that. It's projects that grew out of the planning and the intent on the part of the States or the cities or the regional transit agencies to get good projects done.

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

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

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

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

Mr. NADLER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. OLVER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

□ 0320

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

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

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2208. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Maritime Administration, Operations and Training'' shall be $155,750,000, of which $11,240,000 shall remain available until expended for maintenance and repair of training ships at State Maritime Academies; of which $15,000,000 shall remain available until expended for capital improvements at the United States Merchant Marine Academy; of which $59,057,000 shall be available for operations at the United States Merchant Marine Academy; and of which $6,000,000 shall remain available until expended for the reimbursement of overcharged midshipmen fees for academic years 2003–2004 through 2008–2009, and such reimbursement shall be the final and conclusive disposition of claims for such overcharges.

SEC. 2209. Of the prior year unobligated balances available for ''Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration, Capital Assistance for High Speed Rail Corridors and Intercity Passenger Rail Service'', $2,475,000,000 is rescinded.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 357, line 22 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

Mr. POLIS. I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

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

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

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

Mr. NADLER. I won't take the 5 minutes, but I just wanted to complete a couple of comments on Amtrak from the discussion of the last amendment.

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

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

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

By the same token, we need rail transportation because rail is three times as energy efficient per ton mile for freight. It's far more energy efficient. I don't have the figure, per passenger. We want to decrease our dependence on Middle Eastern oil. We want to have less of borrowing money from China to give it to Middle Eastern potentates who help fund the other side on the war on terror. So we need more rail. The only way we do that is by funding Amtrak, and Amtrak has to put money into capital improvements, to a large extent, because for 50 years there were no capital improvements on the passenger rail system.

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

So Amtrak is cheap enough. And for $850 million for the entire country, which is much too small, it should have been the $1.3 billion, which was the authorized level, we should maintain that level and certainly not go—well, we shouldn't have that level. We should have $1.3 billion, but the CR is bad enough taking it to 850, which only

allows a couple hundred million for capital for the balance of the year. We certainly shouldn't bring it down essentially to zero by adopting the amendment that we just voice voted which will come up to a vote on the floor tomorrow.

□ 0330

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2210. Of the prior year unobligated balances available for ''Department of Transportation, Office of the Secretary, National Infrastructure Investments'', $600,000,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 2211. Of the funds made available for ''Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration, Capital Investment Grants'' in division A of Public Law 111–117, $280,000,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 2212. Of the prior year unobligated balances available for ''Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration, Railroad Safety Technology Program'', $50,000,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 2213. Of the prior year unobligated balances available for ''Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration, Capital Assistance to States—Intercity Passenger Rail Service'', $78,423,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 2214. Of the prior year unobligated balances available for ''Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration, Grants for Energy Efficiency and Greenhouse Gas Reductions'', $75,000,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 2215. Notwithstanding section 1101, no funds are provided for activities described in section 122 of title I of division A of Public Law 111–117.

SEC. 2216. Notwithstanding section 1101, section 172 of title I of division A of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 2217. Notwithstanding section 1101, section 186 of title I of division A of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to fiscal year 2011.

SEC. 2218. Notwithstanding section 1101, no funds are provided for activities described in section 195 of title I of division A of Public Law 111–117.

SEC. 2219. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101 of this division and section 120(a)(5) title I of division A of Public Law 111–117, no obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways for fiscal year 2011 shall be distributed to the following programs: the interstate maintenance discretionary program under section 118(c) of title 23, United States Code; the Transportation, Community, and Systems Preservation program under section 1117 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users; the Ferry Boats discretionary program under sections 129(c) and 147 of title 23, United States Code (except for the funds set aside under section 147(d) of title 23, United States Code); and the delta region transportation development program under section 1308 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users.

(b) The obligation limitation reserved under subsection (a) of this section shall be instead distributed as follows: 20 percent to the interstate maintenance program authorized under section 119 of title 23, United States Code; 26 percent to the surface transportation program authorized under section 133 of title 23, United States Code; 17 percent to the highway bridge program authorized under section 144 of title 23, United States Code; 5 percent to the highway safety improvement program authorized under section 148 of title 23, United States Code; 7 percent to the congestion mitigation and air quality maintenance program authorized under section 149 of title 23; and 25 percent for the national highway system program authorized under section 103 of title 23, United States Code: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Transportation shall distribute the obligation limitation under subsection (a) of this section to each State in the ratio in which such State is apportioned contract authority for such programs for fiscal year 2011 under section 104 and section 144 of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 2220. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Public and Indian Housing, Tenant-Based Rental Assistance'' shall be $14,080,098,711, to remain available through September 30, 2012, shall be available on October 1, 2010 (in addition to the $4,000,000,000 previously appropriated under such heading that became available on October 1, 2010), and an additional $4,000,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2013, shall be available on October 1, 2011: *Provided*, That of the amounts available for such heading, $16,702,688,117 shall be for activities specified in paragraph (1) under such heading of division A of Public Law 111–117, $110,000,000 shall be for activities specified in paragraph (2) under such heading in such Public Law, $1,207,410,594 shall be for activities specified in paragraph (3) under such heading in such Public Law, of which $1,157,410,594 shall be used as provided in the first proviso of such paragraph (3), and $0 shall be for activities specified in paragraph (6) under such heading of such Public Law.

SEC. 2221. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Housing Programs, Project-Based Rental Assistance'' shall be $8,882,328,000, to remain available through September 30, 2012, shall be available on October 1, 2010, and an additional $400,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2013, shall be available on October 1, 2011: *Provided*, That of the amounts available for such heading, $8,950,000,000 shall be for activities specified in paragraph (1) under such heading of division A of Public Law 111–117 and $326,000,000 shall be available for activities specified in paragraph (2) under such heading of such Public Law.

SEC. 2222. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be $0: ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Public and Indian Housing, Revitalization of Severely Distressed Public Housing (HOPE VI)''; ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Public and Indian Housing, Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grants''; ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Housing Programs, Housing Counseling Assistance''; ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Housing Programs, Energy Innovation Fund''; and ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Community Planning and Development, Brownfields Redevelopment''.

SEC. 2223. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Public and Indian Housing, Public Housing Operating Fund'' shall be $4,626,000,000.

SEC. 2224. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Public and Indian Housing, Public Housing Capital Fund'' shall be $1,428,000,000.

SEC. 2225. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Public and Indian Housing, Native American Housing Block Grants'' shall be $500,000,000.

SEC. 2226. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Community Planning and Development, Community Development Fund'' shall be $1,500,000,000: *Provided*, That the funds made available under such heading shall be used only for assistance under the community development block grant program that is provided under section 106 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5306), as amended: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for a Sustainable Communities Initiative.

SEC. 2227. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Community Planning and Development, HOME Investment Partnerships Program'' shall be $1,650,000,000.

SEC. 2228. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes, Lead Hazard Reduction'' shall be $120,000,000.

SEC. 2229. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Housing Administration, Mutual Mortgage Insurance Program Account'' for administrative contract expenses shall be $207,000,000.

SEC. 2230. Of the prior year unobligated balances available for ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Community Planning and Development, Brownfields Redevelopment'', $17,300,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 2231. Of the prior year unobligated balances available for ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Public and Indian Housing, Revitalization of Severely Distressed Public Housing (HOPE VI)'', $198,000,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 2232. Of the prior year unobligated balances available for ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Community Planning and Development, Community Development Fund'', $130,000,000 made available for a Sustainable Communities Initiative is rescinded.

SEC. 2233. Of the prior year unobligated balances available for ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Housing Programs, Energy Innovation Fund'', $49,500,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 2234. The heading ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Management and Administration, Transformation Initiative'' in title II of division A of Public Law 111–117, is amended by striking ''For necessary expenses'' and all that follows through the end of such heading and inserting the following: ''For necessary expenses of information technology modernization including development and deployment of a Next Generation of Voucher Management System and development and deployment of modernized Federal Housing Administration systems, $71,000,000: *Provided*, That not more than 25 percent of the funds made available for information technology modernization may be obligated until the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development submits to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a plan for expenditure that (1) identifies, for each modernization project (A) the functional and performance capabilities to be delivered and the mission benefits to be realized, (B) the estimated lifecycle cost, and (C) key milestones to be met; (2) demonstrates that each modernization project is (A) compliant with the Department's enterprise architecture, (B) being managed in accordance with applicable lifecycle management policies and guidance, (C) subject to the Department's capital planning and investment control requirements, and (D) supported by an adequately staffed project office; and (3) has been reviewed by the Government Accountability Office.''.

SEC. 2235. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''National Railroad Passenger Corporation, Office of Inspector General, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $19,350,000.

SEC. 2236. No rescission made in this title shall apply to any amount previously designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 2237. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Housing Programs, Housing for the Elderly'' shall be $237,700,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be used for capital advances or project rental assistance contracts.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 357, line 22 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DIVISION C—STIMULUS RESCISSIONS

SEC. 3001. (a) There are hereby rescinded all unobligated balances remaining available as of February 11, 2011, of the discretionary appropriations provided by division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5).

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to funds appropriated or otherwise made available to Offices of Inspector General and the Recovery Act Accountability and Transparency Board by division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5).

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to offer this amendment with my colleague from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), a strong advocate for commonsense policies.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply changes the date by which the bill rescinds obligated funds. By moving the date to the end of the fiscal year, September 30, it allows for everyone, from local government to innovative clean-tech companies, the ability to plan for the rest of their fiscal year and not have grants yanked from under their feet. We should not change the rules on people in the middle of the game. It really calls into question the reliability of the Federal Government.

There are so many grants in the queues of these agencies. And calling all funds unobligated after February 11 will be devastating to local communities and small businesses that are just looking for long-term stability throughout the rest of the fiscal year. Changing the rules after the fact is never a strong, good practice.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is pro-business, pro-infrastructure, pro-local government, and deserves to be supported. The amendment is also fiscally responsible and meets the House budget rules.

My State of Colorado provides an example as to why this date should be changed. Colorado was awarded a $10 million TIGER/TIFIA Challenge grant through the Recovery Act that expands one of the most heavily used and heavily congested highways in our State, creating jobs, fostering economic development, multi-modal transportation, the lifeblood of my congressional district and the greater State of Colorado. This $10 million investment helps leverage additional funds in the area, creating $276 million in employment income and over 7,200 jobs.

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

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

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

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

Colorado's U.S. 36 application did not anticipate a TIFIA loan, but Colorado and the U.S. 36 embraced the challenge. The application is in, and the obligation is expected by September of 2011, consistent with the intention of the challenge grant in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, in addition, my amendment would ensure that the long process of applying for a loan guarantee at the Department of Energy—not a grant, simply a loan in this tight credit market—would not mean projects already in the queue would be thrown out. How can we tell a private company to spend time and money applying for something, have it awarded, and then turn around and take it off the table? That's simply bad for business. Similar programs at the World Bank and IMF treat the loan authority authorized by Congress as obligated funds once they are appropriated. We owe it to our small businesses and local governments to provide predictability with regard to Federal funding streams.

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1 attempts to save the American taxpayer on a number of fronts.

First, we cut $100 billion from regular government spending. Second, we went a step further for the taxpayer by rescinding the remaining balances of the failed stimulus bill, about $5 billion if we act now. We need to act now to stop any more funds from being spent. The longer we wait, the longer we let the administration shop around with the taxpayers' hard-earned money.

Further, we were told that the stimulus bill was the lightning bolt that would put America back to work right away. If these funds haven't been already obligated, when are the people going back to work? Where is the instant impact? Where are the jobs? Unemployment is still over 9 percent in many areas of the country and upwards of 15 percent in other sections. If the funds have not been obligated by now, they probably weren't meant to be in the stimulus package.

Let's save the taxpayers $5 billion today and rescind these funds now. I urge a ''no'' vote.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. I want to commend again and congratulate the gentleman from Colorado for offering this amendment, and I want to support this

amendment, though I realize the realities of the situation that we are in.

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

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

The gentleman's amendment highlights an example of how the majority's rhetoric and political posturing on the continuing resolution come at the expense of good policy.

If you had presented this project that the gentleman from Colorado has put forward to a Member on the other side of the aisle, they would agree that the use of a $10 million grant to leverage over $200 million in non-Federal funds is a perfect example of the potential for public-private partnerships. But the moment you mention the project genesis within the President's Recovery Act, their tune turns to righteous condemnation.

□ 0340

More broadly, there are other projects across the country that would be impacted by the rescission's political intent. In particular, efforts to address congestion that is choking our transportation network through the creation of a 21st-century high-speed rail system would be halted in many regions. For example, $110 million to improve connections to Amtrak's Northeast Corridor within the Nation's most densely populated region is also caught up in the same problem that the gentleman from Colorado is talking about. So it would be an entirely rational thing to allow the ARRA funds to be implemented until September 30, 2011, as has been suggested.

I support the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3002. Hereafter, no Federal agency administering funds provided by division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5) may provide funding or reimbursement to any entity awarded funds from such Act for the cost associated with physical signage or other advertisement indicating that a project is funded by such Act.

DIVISION D—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 4001. The amount by which each applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of related proposed new budget authority is as follows:

(1) Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, $1,972,000,000.

(2) Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, $1,405,000,000.

(3) Defense, $1,500,000,000.

(4) Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies, $100,000,000.

(5) Financial Services and General Government, $750,000,000.

(6) Homeland Security, $1,000,000,000.

(7) Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, $1,750,000,000.

(8) Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, $10,901,000,000.

(9) Legislative Branch, $100,000,000.

(10) Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, $500,000,000.

(11) State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, $2,000,000,000.

(12) Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, $3,923,000,000.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

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

HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. today.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 43 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Thursday, February 17, 2011, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

508. A letter from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Emerald Ash Borer; Addition of Quarantined Areas in Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Pennsylvania, West Virgina, and Wisconsin [Docket No.: APHIS-2009-0098] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

509. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Prevention of Payments to Deceased Persons (RIN: 0560-AH91) received January 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

510. A letter from the Chief Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, Regulation Restructuring: Issuance Regulation Update and Reorganization To Reflect the End of Coupon Issuance Systems (RIN: 0584-AD48) received January 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

511. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza [Docket No.: APHIS-2006-0074] (RIN: 0579-AC36) received January 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

512. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Loan Servicing; Farm Loan Programs (RIN: 0560-AI05) received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

513. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Departmant of Defense, transmitting a report Pursuant to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009; to the Committee on Armed Services.

514. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Marking of Government-Furnished Property (DFARS Case 2008-D050) (RIN: 0750-AG44) received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

515. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8167] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

516. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket IN: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8165] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

517. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a letter of notification to authorize an unconditional guarantee on a supply chain finance facility; to the Committee on Financial Services.

518. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation,