an offer. The gentleman wants to talk about the President. Article I of the Constitution says we need to do this. This is our responsibility. The people elected us to do it. And the people elected us to reach agreement.

And how do you reach agreement? This is what I want. This is what you want. We have come up. We have moved; pretty substantially. We think it was appropriate to move. Now we are asking you, are you prepared to move from the position you have taken consistently at your figure, which a lot of your folks think has problems in its constituent parts?

□ 1300

I'm asking you, and I can't get an answer, and you apparently are not going to make a counteroffer as to, okay, we took 100, we passed it, couldn't pass the Senate, you offered something in return. And what I mean by ''you,'' the Senate didn't pass it. The gentleman is absolutely correct. But we Democrats have made the offer here and there of the $51 billion. The President has indicated he could sign that. He said that publicly.

Now, that's our offer sitting on the table. My suspicion is you've rejected that offer. And if you have rejected it, what is your counteroffer? That is my question.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman again.

Not to belabor the point, but I did say, Mr. Speaker, that there were not 60 votes in the Senate for the offer he speaks of. In fact, there were more votes for the $60 billion off of the current funding levels that is our plan. So there is really no offer on the table that is valid because it can't pass the Senate.

What is the Democratic Senate's offer on the table? The gentleman rightfully says it is up to us in Congress. The people elect us to try and come together and agree upon a spending plan. What is the offer? There is no offer that could pass in the Senate. We passed the House version. We know where the House stands. So I'm just having difficulty in understanding where the offer is.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has made his points. He is frustrated because he sees there is no movement because the Senate has been unable to get an offer on the table that can garner 60 votes. So the gentleman wants us to negotiate with ourselves. No. We want to cut spending and keep the government open. That's why we're in the position we are, to do another stopgap measure so that we can hopefully iron out some differences, cooperate in trying to keep the government open, and cut spending so that people in the private sector get back to work.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

As I understand what the gentleman is saying, if the Senate can't get 60 votes—which, of course, we have seen the gridlock for a long period of time where the Senate can't get 60 votes—that we're not going to go anywhere from the offer that he's made to pass something that can, in fact, garner 60 votes in the Senate.

I regret that the Senate, frankly, didn't get 60 votes for our offer. And he is correct that he got a few more votes for H.R. 1 than was gotten for the Senate majority leader's counteroffer. But the fact of the matter is this is really an issue between the Republicans and the Democrats.

Senator MCCONNELL has said, as I know the majority leader says, we'll pass what the House passes. That's what he said. Now, if that's the case, then we need to pass something that can garner 60 votes over there. We know that H.R. 1 couldn't get 60 votes. We know that Senator REID's proposal couldn't get 60 votes.

And if we're going to move this government forward and not fund it on 2-week cycles—and Senator MCCAIN has said that funding the Defense Department on 2-week or 3-week cycles is undermining our national security. So there is no disagreement that doing things 2 weeks at a time does not make sense. And if the gentleman's view is simply you will not make some offer that we think—and we can have a discussion about trying to come to agreement on that—that we can get 60 votes for in the Senate and we're going to fund it on 2-week cycles, I say to my friend, that's going to be damaging to the economy, create great uncertainty, and undermine our national security. And I would hope that the gentleman would see fit to determine where we can meet somewhere in the middle.

We think we've come 51 percent of the way towards your hundred. Towards your hundred. You keep talking about 60. That was not your pledge. Your pledge was 100. And the way you got to 100 was to count the 41. We've done that. We've done another 10. So we've come, we think, 51 percent of the way. You don't count it that way, and we understand that. But whatever way we come, we need to move on.

You won the majority. God bless you. I'm sorry about that, but I live with it, and there it is. You have the majority. And with the majority, you have the responsibility to see if we can move this country forward. That's what Newt Gingrich said. And you can't be the perfectionist caucus, as he referred to, of sticking just at a number that doesn't have the votes in the United States Senate.

And if we're going to be on this 2-week cycle, I will tell my friend, you may keep passing these 2 weeks at a time. None of us want to shut down government. But I will tell you that while I and my colleagues, some of my colleagues, may vote to do this one more time, for me, it's the last time. We need to have a plan to fund this government for the balance of the fiscal year to September 30. It is irresponsible for us not to have that. And just each of us sticking to our number, you sticking to your number, and just pointing fingers at one another saying ''the Senate can't get 60 votes for anything we propose'' will not serve our country or our people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 14, 2011

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF DR. MICHAEL ALESSANDRI

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a great individual of my south Florida community, Dr. Michael Alessandri, for his work with children and young adults who have been diagnosed with autism. Dr. Alessandri, a professor of psychology at my alma mater, the University of Miami, will be honored at the Kesher Annual Scholarship Journal Dinner to celebrate his commitment to this amazing organization.

Kesher, an organization that provides an academic and Jewish education to children with special needs, was formed in 1995 with two classrooms and 20 students. Today, with the help of Dr. Alessandri, the organization is shaping the lives of over 80 children and young adults with autism through their personalized student curriculum. Dr. Allesandri's dedication to helping children and young adults with autism obtain an education has been fundamental to the success of Kesher.

Once again, I would like to congratulate Dr. Alessandri and all of the staff, faculty, and parents and the students of Kesher, and hope others follow his lead in making our community a better place in which to live.

LEASE EXTENSION AND SECURE ENERGY ACT OF 2011

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, unemployment is still at nearly 9 percent, $4 gasoline is on the way, and the Obama administration still doesn't get it. They've locked up our domestic energy resources through the recently issued Wild Lands order, which had no congressional authority, and they continue to pursue regulatory drilling moratoria.

Every developed country in the world looks to their own resources to fuel their economies. We have access to resources that dwarf the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and we can finally put our country on a path to energy independence. The United States has vast energy resources on our public lands and off our coasts that belong to the taxpayers.

This is why I've introduced the Lease Extension and Secure Energy Act of 2011. This bill would extend offshore leases impacted by the Obama administration's drilling moratorium for an additional 12 months. This legislation would return time lost during the drilling moratorium, adding certainty so domestic producers can continue exploration without a looming lease expiration.

We need the stability that comes from an all-of-the-above energy approach. We need a commonsense energy policy that brings stability to the marketplace, creates good paying American jobs, grows our economy, reduces our dependence on foreign oil, and raises trillions of dollars to help pay off our growing $14 trillion national debt. We owe this to our children and to our grandchildren.

IN HONOR OF ANN'S CHOICE

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, this past week, I had the privilege of addressing about 700 residents back home in my district, the residents of the Ann's Choice retirement community in Warminster Township, Bucks County, and to thank those residents and senior citizens for collectively putting together over 55,000 hours of community service, really outstanding community service, back home in Bucks County.

Some of the many activities that accounted for a tremendous amount of hours included tutoring and reading to elementary school children, providing wheelchair escorts, sorting and packaging clothing for the needy, creating blankets for ill children, and providing comfort to those in need.

Mr. Speaker, communities are built on service to others. Through this service, the community of Ann's Choice is, in fact, strong and vibrant. The countless lives they have touched have made Bucks County a stronger and better place to live, and for that I salute them.

□ 1310

CATASTROPHIC CUTS

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

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk a little bit about what has been going on recently. We heard a little colloquy just a moment ago with the majority leader and the minority leader talking about what is going on in H.R. 1 and some of the catastrophic cuts that are being proposed by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I spoke earlier during the debate on H.R. 1, and found from communications that the people back in my district in Oregon are taking it seriously. They are worried that we will do the devastating $60 billion worth of cuts within a short, 1-year time frame that has been universally panned, actually, by experts across the country.

My colleagues and I on the Democratic side have offered alternatives that I think are a little more reasonable. We realize, as the gentleman from Maryland talked about, we need to make some reductions, but we should make them in a serious way, something that will accomplish our goals. I think scaring Americans needlessly is inappropriate.

The cuts they are talking about are not going to happen. The Food and Drug Administration, we just passed a food safety bill in the last Congress, and they want to cut $240 million below the 2010 level, much less implement the Food and Drug Safety Administration work that we have asked them to do. USDA would be furloughing inspectors. Our meat safety programs would not be safe. We would not be able to have the processing plants inspected on a regular basis going forward.

The ability for some of our small, rural communities to have safe drinking water hinges on the wastewater and drinking programs that we have, the revolving loan funds that we have here in Congress. Reducing the programs as much as Republicans want would cause serious, serious problems. It would also eliminate 54,000 engineering, construction, and support jobs as a result of this. We need to be adding jobs, not subtracting jobs at this point in time.

We also have State and local grants. We have States back home, and our local communities are starving right now. A lot of the budgets are out of whack. The worst thing we can be doing is cutting our State grant programs which fund the education, public safety, and health care needs of our local communities. We should actually be empowering and helping them through these tough budget times, and only the Federal Government has that ability.

The firefighter grants are being cut. COPS grants are being cut. Our public safety is at serious risk here. I can't believe this is being proposed in any serious manner whatsoever. I have to assume it is all part of the political theater and part of the campaign still. It is time to get off the campaign trail and quit the political circus and get back to actually worrying about serious reductions we have to make to put our country back in balance, and that means going to other programs.

They are also wanting to cut title 1 grants to school districts. This is the one area where the Federal Government actually comes to the aid of the local school districts with special ed and IDEA moneys that they need to actually make sure that they can deliver those high-cost special needs programs to students. We are actually cutting them: $700 million from the two big formula programs we have here. It is a 4 percent cut to title 1 programming when our local districts need it the most.

Head Start, a proven, performance-based program to get our kids off to a great start and a great education so they don't need the remediation that we have to do later on in high school and college. They are cutting Head Start 20 percent, so 200,000 children would be kicked out of the Head Start program. I don't think that's the way you become a world leader. I don't think that is going to help our STEM programs do the research and innovation we need.

Pell Grants. Pell Grants, a commitment we made to American students, I think it is really important. Back home in Oregon, I worked very, very hard on a scholarship program that actually, with our Federal aid, our State aid, scholarship programs, parental involvement, and student working at a minimum wage job during the summer full time and during the school year part-time, the student could actually graduate from college with an undergraduate degree and no more than $13,000 or $14,000 in debt. When we take our share of the bargain away by cutting the Pell Grant program from our promised level of $5,500 down to $4,700, that can make the difference between young men and women actually being able to afford that college education so they can compete with the best and brightest around the world.

Job training. It is unbelievable to me that in H.R. 1, our Republican colleagues are cutting job training employment services; more than $4 billion in cuts to job training programs. This is unconscionable, folks. This is exactly the time when we need to get these dislocated workers back into the workforce. The Trade Adjustment Act cuts are unconscionable. We need to make sure that there is an opportunity for these folks to retrain, get back in the workforce, pay taxes, and help get the economy back on track. Cutting these programs just doesn't make any sense.

They are even cutting Social Security, folks. Pretty amazing. They cut the operational budget from $125 million below the 2010 level, and $1 billion dollars below the President's requested level for 2011. They apparently don't think that we need technology to improve Social Security's ability to work with seniors and make sure that they get the services they need, to cut down on mistakes and to cut down on the fraud and abuse in the benefit programs for our deserving Social Security recipients. They don't care. They really don't care. It is pretty amazing the range and scope of these cuts.