AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

# Union Calendar No. 5

112TH CONGRESS
*1st Session*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
112–12

R E P O R T

ON THE

# REVISED SUBALLOCATION OF BUDGET ALLOCATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011

SUBMITTED BY MR. ROGERS, CHAIRMAN,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

TOGETHER WITH

## MINORITY AND ADDITIONAL VIEWS



FEBRUARY 14, 2011.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

99–006 WASHINGTON : 2011 **SBDV 2011–2**

## COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

HAROLD ROGERS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

C. W. BILL YOUNG, Florida [1]
JERRY LEWIS, California [1]
FRANK R. WOLF, Virginia
JACK KINGSTON, Georgia
RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN, New Jersey
TOM LATHAM, Iowa
ROBERT B. ADERHOLT, Alabama
JO ANN EMERSON, Missouri
KAY GRANGER, Texas
MICHAEL K. SIMPSON, Idaho
JOHN ABNEY CULBERSON, Texas
ANDER CRENSHAW, Florida
DENNY REHBERG, Montana
JOHN R. CARTER, Texas
RODNEY ALEXANDER, Louisiana
KEN CALVERT, California
JO BONNER, Alabama
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE, Ohio
TOM COLE, Oklahoma
JEFF FLAKE, Arizona
MARIO DIAZ-BALART, Florida
CHARLES W. DENT, Pennsylvania
STEVE AUSTRIA, Ohio
CYNTHIA M. LUMMIS, Wyoming
TOM GRAVES, Georgia
KEVIN YODER, Kansas
STEVE WOMACK, Arkansas
ALAN NUNNELEE, Mississippi

NORMAN D. DICKS, Washington
MARCY KAPTUR, Ohio
PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
NITA M. LOWEY, New York
JOSÉ E. SERRANO, New York
ROSA L. DELAURO, Connecticut
JAMES P. MORAN, Virginia
JOHN W. OLVER, Massachusetts
ED PASTOR, Arizona
DAVID E. PRICE, North Carolina
MAURICE D. HINCHEY, New York
LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, California
SAM FARR, California
JESSE L. JACKSON, JR., Illinois
CHAKA FATTAH, Pennsylvania
STEVEN R. ROTHMAN, New Jersey
SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR., Georgia
BARBARA LEE, California
ADAM B. SCHIFF, California
MICHAEL M. HONDA, California
BETTY MCCOLLUM, Minnesota

---

[1] Chairman Emeritus

WILLIAM B. INGLEE, *Clerk and Staff Director*

## LETTER OF SUBMITTAL

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
*Washington, DC, February 14, 2011.*

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
*The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: By direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I submit herewith the Committee's report on the suballocation of budget allocations for fiscal year 2011.

As required by section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this report subdivides the allocation of fiscal year 2011 spending authority to the House Committee on Appropriations established pursuant to section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress).

Sincerely,

HAROLD ROGERS,
*Chairman.*

**Union Calendar No. 5**

112TH CONGRESS *1st Session* | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | REPORT 112–12

# REPORT ON THE REVISED SUBALLOCATION OF BUDGET ALLOCATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011

FEBRUARY 14, 2011.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. ROGERS, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

## R E P O R T

### REVISED SUBALLOCATION OF BUDGET ALLOCATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report on the suballocation of budget allocations for fiscal year 2011 pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. This report is consistent with the "Budget Allocations" established pursuant to section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress).

## REVISED SUBALLOCATIONS TO SUBCOMMITTEES FISCAL YEAR 2011 BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS

[In millions of dollars]

| Subcommittee | Discretionary | Mandatory | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration: | | | |
| Budget authority | 20,065 | 111,874 | 131,939 |
| Outlays | 22,818 | 100,731 | 123,549 |
| Commerce, Justice, Science: | | | |
| Budget authority | 54,115 | 256 | 54,371 |
| Outlays | 65,343 | 266 | 65,609 |
| Defense: | | | |
| Budget authority | 517,714 | 292 | 518,006 |
| Outlays | 582,485 | 292 | 582,777 |
| Energy and Water Development: | | | |
| Budget authority | 29,984 | ..... | 29,984 |
| Outlays | 43,779 | ..... | 43,779 |
| Financial Services and General Government: | | | |
| Budget authority | 21,151 | 21,153 | 42,304 |
| Outlays | 24,373 | 21,149 | 45,522 |
| Homeland Security: | | | |
| Budget authority | 42,517 | 1,300 | 43,817 |
| Outlays | 45,057 | 1,348 | 46,405 |
| Interior, Environment: | | | |
| Budget authority | 29,596 | 450 | 30,046 |
| Outlays | 33,158 | 451 | 33,609 |
| Labor, Health and Human Services, Education: | | | |
| Budget authority | 157,020 | 560,777 | 717,797 |
| Outlays | 200,613 | 561,975 | 762,588 |
| Legislative Branch: | | | |
| All except Senate: | | | |
| Budget authority | 3,562 | 107 | 3,669 |
| Outlays | 3,579 | 106 | 3,685 |
| Senate items: | | | |
| Budget authority | 1,000 | 26 | 1,026 |
| Outlays | 981 | 25 | 1,006 |
| Total Legislative: | | | |
| Budget authority | 4,562 | 133 | 4,695 |
| Outlays | 4,560 | 131 | 4,691 |
| Military Construction, Veterans Affairs: | | | |
| Budget authority | 74,682 | 69,190 | 143,872 |
| Outlays | 80,860 | 69,000 | 149,860 |
| State, Foreign Operations: | | | |
| Budget authority | 46,953 | 159 | 47,112 |
| Outlays | 48,255 | 159 | 48,414 |
| Transportation, HUD: | | | |
| Budget authority | 56,325 | ..... | 56,325 |
| Outlays | 132,560 | ..... | 132,560 |
| Grand total: | | | |
| Budget authority | 1,054,684 | 765,584 | 1,820,268 |
| Outlays | 1,283,861 | 755,502 | 2,039,363 |

## FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLL CALL NO. 1

Date: February 8, 2011.

Measure: Report on the Suballocation of Budget Allocations, FY 2011.

Motion by: Mr. Rogers.

Description of Motion: To approve the suballocation and order it reported, as amended.

Results: Adopted 27 yeas to 22 nays.

| *Members Voting Yea* | *Members Voting Nay* |
|---|---|
| Mr. Aderholt | Mr. Bishop |
| Mr. Alexander | Ms. DeLauro |
| Mr. Austria | Mr. Dicks |
| Mr. Bonner | Mr. Farr |
| Mr. Calvert | Mr. Fattah |
| Mr. Carter | Mr. Flake |
| Mr. Cole | Mr. Hinchey |
| Mr. Crenshaw | Mr. Honda |
| Mr. Culberson | Mr. Jackson |
| Mr. Dent | Ms. Kaptur |
| Mr. Diaz-Balart | Ms. Lee |
| Mrs. Emerson | Ms. Lowey |
| Mr. Frelinghuysen | Mrs. Lummis |
| Ms. Granger | Ms. McCollum |
| Mr. Graves | Mr. Moran |
| Mr. Kingston | Mr. Olver |
| Mr. Latham | Mr. Price |
| Mr. LaTourette | Mr. Rothman |
| Mr. Lewis | Ms. Roybal-Allard |
| Mr. Nunnelee | Mr. Schiff |
| Mr. Rehberg | Mr. Serrano |
| Mr. Rogers | Mr. Visclosky |
| Mr. Simpson | |
| Mr. Wolf | |
| Mr. Womack | |
| Mr. Yoder | |
| Mr. Young | |

## MINORITY VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE NORM DICKS

The 302(b) funding allocation for Fiscal Year 2011 debated in Committee was regrettably a narrow, one-dimensional approach to the complex challenge of reducing our federal budget deficit at a time when our economy has not yet fully recovered. The approach focused the bulk of its budgetary restraint on non-security discretionary spending—the smallest segment of spending in the budget—and thus the level of budget cuts required would undoubtedly have been detrimental to our task of creating jobs and assuring our economic recovery. You cannot "cut and grow," as this approach would assume, and if our economy doesn't grow, no amount of budget slashing will ever be enough to bring the budget back into the positive balance we last enjoyed at the end of the Clinton Administration. The Republican 302(b) allocation not only imposes precipitous cuts that most economists would consider unwise at a time when nationwide unemployment remains at 9 percent, but their approach ignores the need to make the strategic investments in our future that will also assist our economic recovery in the near term. There isn't much that the Chamber of Commerce and the AFL–CIO agree on, but their leaders issued a joint statement on Jan. 26th that correctly stated the approach we need at this critical time. They said: *"Whether it is building roads, bridges, high-speed broadband, energy systems and schools, these projects not only create jobs and demand for businesses, they are an investment in building the modern infrastructure our country needs to compete in a global economy."*

Democratic Members of the Appropriations Committee have been concerned that the budget allocations proposed would disrupt even the meager job gains we have seen in recent months. We are convinced that jamming on the fiscal brakes so quickly would have the opposite effect of what the majority ostensibly is intending to accomplish: it would inhibit job growth by slowing down economic growth and increasing the deficit.

Even worse, after the Republican leadership presented a draft bill based on this risky budget allocation, the most conservative members of the Republican caucus objected and demanded that their leaders impose an additional $26 billion in budget cuts simply in order to adhere to an arbitrary $100 billion level that was pulled out of thin air and inserted into a campaign press release last fall. At this point there is no suggestion that the new bill introduced by the majority was prepared with any sensitivity to the need to avoid further job losses. The specific cuts are indiscriminate. They would cost jobs, delay economic recovery and hurt people all across America. They would terminate the program that helps homeless veterans get off the streets and out of shelters; reduce the number of meat and poultry inspectors that will result in processing plants shutting down and the cost of food increasing; remove more than

200,000 kids from the Head Start program; reduce the maximum Pell Grant award by $800 per college student; slash the program that puts more cops on the beat and helps local law enforcement keep citizens safe and put crooks in jail. And the list goes on and on. These are brutal cuts, hastily suggested during a budget exercise conducted solely for political purposes.

As Democrats, we are willing to work with our colleagues on the other side to identify unnecessary and wasteful programs; however, we will not hesitate to promote and defend programs that create jobs and help us turn the corner on the economy. We can do better. We should reject this arbitrary and unwise budget proposal for Fiscal Year 2011. We should work together, bearing in mind the need to create jobs and keep our economy growing, to develop a reasonable and economically-defensible budget proposal that the Senate will accept and the President will sign. And then we should proceed to work on the Fiscal Year 2012 budget in a way that will give Americans confidence that Congress is doing the job we've been sent here to do.

NORM DICKS.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE FLAKE

The coming months will require every member of the House Appropriations Committee to face difficult decisions and make tough choices. Unfortunately, the proposed subcommittee allocations for the remainder of fiscal year 2011 failed to make good on past commitments or fully realize the new fiscal realities that members face in the 112th Congress. As such, I had little choice but to oppose the fiscal year 2011 302(b) allocations considered in the Committee's organizational meeting on February 9, 2011.

In the run-up to the elections in November, the *Pledge to America* offered by House Republicans clearly stated that "[w]ith common-sense exceptions for seniors, veterans, and our troops, we will roll back government spending to pre-stimulus, pre-bailout levels," a move that would save taxpayers "at least $100 billion in the first year alone" when compared with the President's fiscal year 2011 non-security request. Yet, in an apples-to-apples comparison of the President's fiscal year 2011 non-security request to the fiscal year 2011 non-security subcommittee allocations, the math results in only a $58 billion reduction. I recognize that the failure of the Democrat-controlled 111th Congress to produce a budget put us in a very difficult position. However, the fiscal year 2011 committee allocation setting discretionary budget authority filed by the Budget Committee Chairman is a spending ceiling and not a floor. As such, there was nothing preventing the Appropriations Committee from making good on the pledge by considering subcommittee allocations below the filed limit on discretionary spending. The 302(b) report instead set committee allocations that fell $42 billion short of the $100 billion target, and very clearly and publicly missed that mark.

Fiscal year 2008 spending levels bear no real significance. The national debt has passed the $14 trillion mark and continues to climb, and the $1.5 trillion dollar deficit expected this year will set yet another record. The $100 billion goal is a veritable rounding error in terms of the debt and would have to be achieved 15 times over to wipe away the current deficit. We will have to take drastic steps if we are to get our fiscal house in order. When we asked taxpayers to give us the gavel, we told them we would deliver $100 billion in cuts to non-discretionary spending in the first year and we should deliver on that pledge.

As the Committee set out to tackle the work of the 112th Congress, there was positive sentiment regarding "returning to regular order." Whether real or perceived, the Appropriations Committee has in the past been associated with "black box" procedures and smoky backroom deals. Taxpayers sent a clear message in November that business as usual in Washington is over. I submit that the Committee will need to reach beyond a return to past practices. The House adopted rules for this Congress that increase trans-

parency and I was pleased to see those changes integrated into the Committee's rules package. If the goal is a transparent process benefiting from fully informed members of the Committee having real opportunities for input, then we must do better.

JEFF FLAKE.

○