

Owens  
Palazzo  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peterson  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Quayle  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Reyes  
Ribble  
Richardson  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Rober  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Scalise  
Schiff  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schwartz  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sessions  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Southernland

Stearns  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Terry  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Van Hollen  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walsh (IL)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Webster  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—2

Giffords  
Lewis (GA)

□ 1918

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. CLEAVER, RICHMOND, and DEUTSCH changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 86 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 109, noes 320, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

AYES—109

Adams  
Altire  
Amash  
Bachus  
Barton (TX)  
Benishek  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Bono Mack  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Broun (GA)  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Camp  
Campbell

Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Conaway  
Costello  
Dent  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Flake  
Garrett  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gowdy

Graves (GA)  
Griffith (VA)  
Guinta  
Hall  
Harris  
Hayworth  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hurt  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Jones

Jordan  
Labrador  
Landry  
Lankford  
Lummis  
Mack  
Manzullo  
McClintock  
McKinley  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (CT)  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson

Paul  
Pence  
Peters  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Quayle  
Reed  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rokita  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin

Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Smith (NE)  
Southernland  
Stearns  
Stutzman  
Tipton  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Webster  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

NOES—320

Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Andrews  
Austria  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Baldwin  
Barletta  
Barrow  
Bartlett  
Bass (CA)  
Bass (NH)  
Becerra  
Berg  
Berkley  
Berman  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Black  
Blumenauer  
Bonner  
Boren  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brooks  
Brown (FL)  
Buchanan  
Buerkle  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Canseco  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Castor (FL)  
Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coffman (CO)  
Cohen  
Cole  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro

Denham  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Emerson  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farenthold  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gallegly  
Garamendi  
Gardner  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gonzalez  
Gossar  
Granger  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Gutierrez  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harman  
Harper  
Hartzler  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck  
Heinrich  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Inslee  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.

Johnson, Sam  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly  
Kildee  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kissell  
Kline  
Kucinich  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Long  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Marchant  
Marino  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McCollum  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (PA)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Noem  
Nunnelee  
Olver  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi

Perlmutter  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Polis  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger

Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schiff  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Speler  
Stark  
Stivers  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Terry

Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
West  
Westmoreland  
Wilson (FL)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth  
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Giffords  
King (IA)

Lewis (GA)  
Welch

□ 1924

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 514. An act to extend expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 and Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 relating to access to business records, individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers, and roving wiretaps until December 8, 2011.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

The Committee resumed its sitting. The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, \$9,710,998,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2012.

AMENDMENT NO. 162 OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

Mr. QUIGLEY. 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 33, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$971,099,800)”.

Page 33, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,796,130,300)”.

Page 34, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,674,240,500)”.

Page 34, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,079,741,200)”.

Page 359, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$7,521,211,800)”.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce research and development spending at the Department of Defense by 10 percent. First inclination, we all know research and development is a good thing, but not when it begets wasteful spending. The continuing resolution before us makes deep cuts in non-defense discretionary spending. If we are truly serious about reducing our long-term deficits, we must look at the whole picture—and that picture includes defense.

Non-defense discretionary comprises approximately 15 percent of Federal spending. Meanwhile, defense spending comprises 20 percent of Federal spending. We cannot ignore one-fifth of the budget. As Admiral Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has said, “Our national debt is our biggest national security threat.”

My amendment would cut a modest 10 percent from the Department of Defense’s research and development budget. DOD’s R&D spending has experienced more spending growth since 2001 than any other major DOD appropriation category. DOD’s research, development, testing and evaluation budget has increased 63 percent over the last 10 years, rising from \$49.2 billion in FY 2001 to \$80.2 billion in FY 2010. This is 33 percent more than the Cold War peak in real terms, even though today we face no traditional adversary comparable to the Soviet Union. Further, in FY 2009, R&D spending exceeded China’s entire defense budget, the world’s second largest, by \$10.5 billion.

Surely as we look for places to balance the budget and in light of the vast superiority of our R&D budget, we can afford to reduce spending by 10 percent.

□ 1930

A number of fiscal commissions and watchdog groups agree that DOD research and development should be cut and proposed a number of proposals to reduce this development. The Sustainable Defense Task Force, a panel of defense experts from across the political spectrum, recently recommended requiring DOD to set its priorities and reduce R&D spending by \$5 billion per year over 10 years. Additionally, the Cato Institute and the Task Force for a Unified Security Budget agree research

and development could be significantly improved without harming security in order to achieve savings.

The Fiscal Commission and the Bipartisan Policy Center have also put forward proposals to reduce research and development costs. The Fiscal Commission proposes reducing DOD’s R&D budget by 10 percent, for a savings of \$7 billion in 2015. They pointed out this reduction would leave DOD at a level above the peak of the Reagan years in real dollars.

The Fiscal Commission cites several ongoing projects that could be reduced or even canceled in order to reduce R&D costs. These programs include the Marine Corps version of the F-35, which has been put on a 2-year probation period by Secretary Gates for continued technical problems, cost overruns, and delays.

The Bipartisan Policy Center offers a similar plan, calling for reduced funding of R&D proportional to the reduction size of forces, or 18.5 percent. Reduction in R&D would be possible, argues the Bipartisan Policy Center, as we withdraw from Iraq and Afghanistan and reduce our forces abroad. Such a reduction in R&D will impose greater discipline in research investments while continuing to budget significantly more resources than any other country’s R&D. A cut in our defense R&D is also enabled by new security threats we face.

Secretary Gates has called for a reorientation of our national security strategy, with a greater focus on counterinsurgency warfare rather than traditional warfare. This reorientation calls for investment in intelligence gathering, devices to sense improvised explosive devices, and investments in lower cost machines such as drones, and will allow us to move away from the more expensive development of major weapons systems.

We must reduce our deficit and we must reduce our spending, but in doing so we must put everything on the table and cut anywhere where waste exists.

Mr. Chairman, there is a universe of thought that less government is best and that government can do almost nothing right. That thought ends at the Department of Defense. There are those who believe they can do no wrong. They have the Department of Defense blinders on, which blind them from the fact that if we are going to make these cuts and we are going to face the very real threats that this debt and deficits will create for us, we have to cut across all lines.

I yield back.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I would say to the House, in the \$14.8 billion that the subcommittee recommended which is in this bill, a reduction in the defense budget, a very large amount of that was reducing the research and develop-

ment program. But you can’t reduce research and development too much.

I don’t care what the best weapons system you have is or that you are planning on having or that you have in the process, in the conceptual stage even. It never gets to where the soldier and the sailor and the airman and the marine needs it without research and development that makes it possible and feasible to build it and deploy it.

We have already cut a substantial amount out of R&D. We can’t put a soldier on the battlefield, and if his system that he is working with doesn’t work, we can’t recall it like you can an automobile or a medicine or pill or something like that. It has got to work. I don’t want to see an American trooper on the front line, whether he is on the ground, whether he is in the air, whether he is on the sea, whether he is under the sea, that has a failed system because we failed to properly research it during the development stage.

So I understand that there are some who would cut defense just to cut defense. If you are going to reduce the defense budget, there ought to be a good reason. There is not a good reason for reducing this account. We have already reduced the Defense Department \$14.8 billion, and I just hope that nobody is tempted to vote for this just because it is a cut.

I yield back.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, similar to the Small Business Innovation Research, this is actually one of the very most important things we can be doing within the defense budget, not just for national security, but equally for our national economy.

This is the line item that funded the Internet. The whole concept of the Internet came from DARPA, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, which is funded in this category of the defense budget RDT&E, Research, Development, Testing, and Evaluation. Imagine what the Internet has meant to the American economy, let alone the world. Look what just happened in Egypt, ultimately because of the Internet.

The GPS system that we have in our vehicles, we take it for granted now. Where did it come from? The RDT&E account in the Defense Department. This is what we want to cut out? We can’t afford to.

The unmanned aerial vehicles, the drones, the most effective warfighting weapon we have right now, a weapon that doesn’t put our soldiers’ lives at risk but is maximally effective at targeting the enemy, RDT&E. Defense research.

Precision targeting was a result of research innovation within this account. That is what gives us our cutting edge. That is why we have the most effective defense capability in the world. But it is also one of the reasons

why we have the strongest economy in the world. There is no other area of research that means as much to this economy, and, frankly, it means a great deal to the entire world's economy.

The National Institutes of Health, we do wonderful research there, but, notwithstanding the lives we save, the spinoff to the private sector is not as extensive as the spinoff from the research we do within the Defense Department.

I guess it is a good thing we get these amendments because it gives us an opportunity to explain to the American people, particularly the taxpayer, what they are getting for their money, where these ideas come from. Many of them come from the Defense Department, and it is because of the investment we have made in research, development, testing, and evaluation.

So I obviously would urge rejection of this amendment.

I yield back my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, \$17,961,303,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2012: *Provided*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph which are available for the V-22 may be used to meet unique operational requirements of the Special Operations Forces: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for the Cobra Judy program.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ROONEY

Mr. ROONEY. 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 33, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$225,000,000)".

Page 34, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$225,000,000)".

Page 359, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$450,000,000)".

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment striking funding for an extra engine for the F-35 fighter jet to immediately save the American taxpayers \$450 million. It is dubious why Congress continues to fund a program that the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Department of Defense adamantly state they do not want. Just today, Defense Secretary Robert Gates called the program "an unnecessary and extravagant expense" and stated that this money is needed for higher priority defense efforts.

□ 1940

As we decide which cuts to make in our defense, ones that won't hurt our troops today, this should be at the top of the list. Mr. Chairman, the American people sent us here to change the way that Washington works. This amendment is a perfect opportunity to show your constituents that business as usual in Washington is over. I urge my colleagues to follow through with their promises, to listen to the voters as to why they sent us here, and to vote to strike the funding for this expensive and unnecessary program.

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

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

Mr. BARTLETT. During the debate to strike funding for the F-35 competitive engine you're likely to hear many statements that just don't square with the facts in the program. Just today, I have heard that it has been stated that the primary engine for the F-35 aircraft has, in one case, 200,000 flight test hours; another statement said 20,000 test hours. The reality is the F-35 primary engine has, as of the end of 2010, just 680 flight test hours and has 90 percent of its flight testing to go.

You're also likely to hear that there are almost 30 U.S. military aircraft that operate with a sole source engine. That's interesting. The F-35 aircraft is a single engine aircraft. No fighter aircraft engine has ever been required to do what the F-35 engine is required to do—provide powered flight and also power a lift fan for the short takeoff and vertical-landing F-35B. In fact, this challenging act of physics has just resulted in the F-35B being put on "probation" by the Secretary of Defense, requiring redesign of the F-35B unique engine components. The current estimate to complete development of the F135 primary engine has been extended several years and the estimated cost to complete the development program is 450 percent above the February, 2008, estimated completion cost.

In fact, only two U.S. operational aircraft are single engine aircraft—the Air Force F-16 and the Marine Corps AV-8B. The F-35 is scheduled to replace those aircraft and will not be operational until at least 2016. The F-16 was the first aircraft to use an alternate engine, beginning in the mid-1980s, and still does so today. Accident rates have trended from 14 mishaps per 100,000 flight hours in 1980 with the Pratt & Whitney engine, when the alternate engine program was first funded, to less than just 2 mishaps per 100,000 flight hours in 2009 for both the Pratt & Whitney and the GE engines. A review of the AV-8B accident data last year indicated an accident rate six times that of the other Navy fighter aircraft, the F-18, and over 3½ times the rate of the F-16. The AV-8B will be replaced by F-35B. So while the alternate engine F-16 has benefited from

competition, with an accident rate having declined by a factor of seven, the AV-8B has an accident rate 3½ times that of the F-16.

Some will cite that the F136—that's the competitive engine—will require \$2.9 billion over 6 years to make it competition ready. It's interesting to note that the cost increase in the contract for the current primary engine, the F-35, is \$3.4 billion, and that does not include other government costs, independent research and development, and component improvement program funding. The entire remaining development of the F-35 competitive engine could have been funded with the overrun to date in the F-35 primary engine. Further, the GAO has found that key assumptions in the cost to go for the F-35 competitive engine were unnecessarily pessimistic based on historic experience with the original alternate engine program.

One of our colleagues has said that the F-35 primary engine is "5 to 7 years ahead of the F136 alternate engine in development." This is not the case at all. First, the acquisition strategy for the F-35 competitive engine called for it to begin 4 years after the primary engine. The Pentagon told us last April that the competitive engine was only 2 to 3 months behind schedule of the original plan. At the same time the Pentagon notified the committee that the F135 primary engine was 24 months behind the schedule set in the original October, 2001, contract. In other words, had both engines begun at the same time, the alternative engine would now be almost 2 years ahead of the primary engine.

I don't know why there's such confusion over the facts related to this issue. Our committee has followed this issue for over 15 years, and we ask you to support the F-35 competitive engine program as an important element to controlling F-35 program costs and future force readiness. The GAO has looked at the competitive engine programs. They have noted that historically the competitive engine always does two things: it makes the engines cheaper and it makes them better. Notice the accident rate that I noted earlier.

Furthermore, this new aircraft is supposed to be ultimately 95 percent of all of the aircraft in all of our services. Can you imagine what would happen if there was a problem with the engine and we had to stand down. We would have essentially no fighter aircraft in any of our services. It is essential we continue with the alternative engine—and I hope not just to continue its development, to make the primary engine better and cheaper, but to provide a second engine for duplication.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, it is time to end the Joint

Strike Fighter second engine mistake. In 2001, the GE engine lost in procurement competition to the one designed by Pratt & Whitney. A sole source development contract was signed in 2005. But since 1997, Congress has provided for a Joint Strike Fighter alternative engine program. This continuing resolution includes \$450 million for the alternate engine in the Joint Strike Fighter.

According to the Pentagon, the second engine's cost is close to \$2.9 billion. The Department of Defense is clear: in their view, our military and the taxpayers are best served by not pursuing a second engine. There are more pressing Department of Defense priorities. There is just no guarantee that having two engines will create enough long-term savings to outweigh the near-term costs of nearly \$3 billion.

The risk from a single engine is reasonable and consistent with past acquisitions. A single engine is not a new approach and does not create dangerous levels of risk. We currently have two current aircraft programs, the F-22 and the F-18, which both utilize a single engine provider. Additional costs and the burden of maintaining two logistical systems are not offset by the potential savings generated through competition.

We are not making procurement decisions in a vacuum. If we had all the money in the world, maybe an alternate engine would be a good idea. But we don't. We have a deficit of \$1.5 trillion and a debt of \$14 trillion, and all our funding choices must—must—acknowledge that.

I urge support for the Rooney amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I can understand that there are a lot of jobs at stake, there's politics, there's regional economies, and so on, to be considered in this issue. I don't particularly have a dog in the hunt, but I'd like to share with you why I disagree with the amendment, why I think it's in the national interest to have an alternative engine.

The experience that we had in the 1980s with the F-16 engine, it seems to me, should inform this debate. We had a sole source contract, basically; with the same manufacturer to build a single engine for the F-16. It was way over budget and outside of—any reasonable production schedule. Production was substantially delayed. And we had little leverage until we brought in an alternative contractor. We brought in competition. All of a sudden we got right on schedule and on budget.

I think this situation is analogous. We're talking about a \$100 billion contract for the principal jet fighter we're going to have for the next generation.

And we have one engine manufacturer that we're going to be reliant upon. It's also going to be one of our most substantial exports to other militaries around the world. It's going to be a very substantial source of jobs and revenue, and in fact, I have to say, military dominance.

□ 1950

What we are talking about is having competition to ensure that we get the best bang for the buck for the taxpayers. In fact, the Government Accountability Office has estimated, over the long run, we will save money through this competition. That's why the majorities of the Armed Services Committee and the Defense Appropriations Committee have decided, after a great deal of deliberation, that we need competition in this program.

If it were not such a major program, if it were not so expensive—a \$100 billion sole-source contract—maybe it wouldn't have mattered, but it was basically the consensus of the authorizing and appropriations committees that we should look to two manufacturers to compete against each other and to give the American taxpayer the greatest bang for the buck in producing the most effective and most efficient jet fighter in the world.

I think we all agree that we believe in the principle of competition. When you have monopoly control—invariably, you slack off a little bit. It's okay to bump your numbers up a little bit, perhaps. But when you have to compete with somebody else, you're always looking at the bottom line, always wanting a higher quality, a less expensive product. That's what this debate is all about. It's about a basic fundamental principle of the American economy—competition. For that reason, I would oppose the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Chairman, this is a debate and a discussion that has been going on for some period of time. As has been noted before, there are many of us who serve on the Armed Services Committee who have a little different view than does the Pentagon on this subject.

So what are the benefits of the second engine? Several of those have been mentioned.

First of all, it is the sense of security. You've got basically an aircraft now that is going to be serving the Marine Corps, the Navy, and the Air Force. All of our services will be dependent on this one aircraft, which is the Joint Strike Fighter. That particular Joint Strike Fighter has one engine. Obviously, if you want it to work well, the engine has to run right.

The Armed Services Committees have taken a look at this, and those

with a few more whiskers here understand the problem that came along on the F-16, where we had an engine manufacturer that couldn't get the engine done, and the whole airframe was at risk. In this case, you have the airframe for the Marine Corps, the Navy, and the Air Force, so this Congress wisely decided that we're going to have two engines.

First of all, from a security point of view, what this allows us to do is to make sure that we have an engine that is on time and on delivery. Certainly, the competition is another good point. You save a lot of money. If you've got two different contractors bidding against each other, we're going to get a good price on the engines, and that's going to be important, particularly year in and year out.

Now, there are a couple of other things that have not been mentioned that I've heard this evening. One of them is that the second engine also has 10 to 15 percent more thrust. What does that mean?

Well, it's interesting. If you happen to be a Marine Corps guy, the marine version of this is called a STOVL. It has to take off from just sitting on a deck, and it takes off straight up. That takes a lot of thrust. The first engine is absolutely maxed out, and what we see over time is we want to put more stuff in our airplanes. When you do that, it gets heavier, and you need more thrust. The second engine offers that 10 to 15 percent more thrust.

I don't know if there is a financial consideration to define what that is worth, but that extra 10 or 15 percent could make the difference of a stable aircraft that could carry some particular additional piece of equipment that we may need in the future.

The other point that I've not heard made and is actually kind of new to us is that these engines are big suckers. They are very, very big turbines, and they have a tremendous amount of power that they're generating.

Now, if we've got this one turbine that works for the Marine Corps, for the Navy and the Air Force, what would happen if we were to use that turbine in other applications? You'd get all the more benefit of having fewer parts and having interchangeability. These engines are bolt-for-bolt interchangeable.

So what happens when we start to look at the design for a future deep strike bomber? One of the questions on that will be: How many engines do you need? Is it going to be a four-engine bomber or a two-engine? Four is a lot more expensive.

What happens if you could get the power of two engines into one and make it a two-engine bomber and use the same engines that are going into JSFs? So now you've got a universal engine working for a number of platforms. There is a whole lot of simplicity and cost savings for that type of thing.

If we're going to put our eggs in one basket, we want to make sure we've

got at least two people and that we have the competition, the capability of using this engine in other ways, and the additional thrust for the second engine.

I would recommend a “no” vote on this amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Chairman, as a ranking subcommittee member of the House Armed Services Committee and as a strong supporter of the Joint Strike Fighter Competitive Engine Program, I rise today in opposition to this amendment for three basic reasons.

First, the competitive engine program will save billions in taxpayer dollars. Second, it will create thousands of jobs. Third, it is imperative to our national security. I think all three of these are issues that all of us share a bipartisan concern about.

I am pleased, in fact, to join both the Armed Services Committee chairman and the ranking member of the full committee as well as many of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle, Democratic and Republican, in supporting this competitive program for the alternative engine.

First, contrary to what you may have heard, the competitive engine program is about saving billions of dollars in taxpayer money. Competition does drive down costs, it does raise quality, and ensures responsiveness from the manufacturers.

With the JSF program being the largest defense program in our Nation's history, we have to make sure that we have that competition to get the best quality and the lowest price. Striking funding for a competitive engine will give a 30-year \$100 billion monopoly to a sole contractor. Funding the F136 engine, however, will allow two companies to compete head to head, resulting in the best price and the best engine. In fact, GAO studies have indicated that competition from the F136 engine will actually save taxpayers \$21 billion over the life of the Joint Strike Fighter program.

Second, the competitive engine program is about saving jobs. Currently, there are 2,500 U.S. jobs supporting the development of the alternative engine. Once full production occurs, the number will rise to 4,000.

Third, the competitive engine program is about national security. Without a competitive engine, U.S. and allied forces will be dependent entirely upon one engine for 90 percent of our fighter jet fleets. One small problem could ground the entire fleet, which is something that none of us would want.

This program is not about favoring one particular contractor over another. It is about having strong bipartisan support for competition, for creating

jobs, for national security, and for saving taxpayer money. In fact, this was demonstrated when this was voted on last year when we had 116 Republicans and 115 Democrats—that's about as even as you can get—vote for the funding of the alternative competitive program.

For these reasons, I strongly oppose this amendment and rise in support of saving \$21 billion in taxpayer money, of creating jobs, and of ensuring our national security through the alternative engine competitive program.

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

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

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to this amendment for a few reasons, not any as eloquent as the ones that have already been stated but for some fairly simple reasons, I think.

Number one, what if one of us here, one of us Members, a Congressman, earmarked a \$100 billion project today? If it were one of us who did this, who said that we're going to give this one job worth \$100 billion to one company, I think there would be an outcry from all over. We don't do that anymore, and there's a reason we don't do it anymore: Because it leads to corruption, and it leads to people doing things that they should not be doing. We shouldn't give the DOD the same—let's call it—temptations to have to give a \$100 billion contract to one company.

□ 2000

Number two, competition. It's interesting now to see how things have switched where you have folks that have been talking about competition when it comes to health care, competition when it comes to business now saying that competition's going to bring quality down and bring costs up. That's not what competition does, Mr. Chairman. What competition does is bring quality up and bring costs down. I think there is definitely bipartisan agreement on that.

And number three, I served in Afghanistan on my third tour and, when I was over there about midway through in 2007, an F-18 went down. It went down here stateside, and the reason it went down is it had a cracked wing, and what we didn't know at that time is if that was an inherent flaw in the F-18 structure. So what we did in Afghanistan is we shut down all F-18 flights. In fact, the world over, F-18 flights were shut down until we could figure out if this problem was inherent in all F-18s or if it was just one problem for that one particular F-18.

If this happens with the F-35, with just one engine, we're going to ground the free world's new jet. That's what will be grounded, because the F-35 is being sold to other countries. It's being used by all of our services except for

the Army, and if it goes down and we have to stop flight for it, it could put people in harm's way. That's why this is, frankly, not a money issue or a jobs issue. This is an issue of operational risk. You should have a backup engine for the main engine for the main fighter for this Nation and other nations going forward.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CONAWAY). The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity to participate in this debate.

Mr. Chairman, I don't have a dog in this fight. Neither of the two fine companies that are arguing over this has jobs in my district that I'm aware of. I'm involved in this argument because I have thousands of service personnel who serve our country, and I have hundreds of thousands of taxpayers who pay for the government of our country, and I am convinced that the right answer for our service personnel and for our taxpayers is to oppose this amendment.

We have heard many good reasons. I think the ones that stand out the most are these. As the Chair well knows, he and I were given the privilege and responsibility of looking at defense procurement across the board over the course of the last 3 or 4 years. Something very rare happened when the gentleman in the chair and I worked on this. We produced two pieces of legislation that passed the House, essentially unanimously. And in that process of Democrat and Republican working together, we learned something very disturbing, and that was that, in major weapons systems, costs had skyrocketed by \$296 billion over what they were supposed to cost, and the delay in fielding these systems had gone from an average of 16 months behind to 22 months behind. That was very unwelcome news.

In the course of conducting that analysis, we also learned something that I think most Americans know intuitively. When you have more choice and you have more competition, you get a better result. I think most of us, when we've had to buy a household appliance or a car, go out and get a couple of quotes. We have people compete against each other so we get the best deal. That very commonsense concept is the core argument in front of us this evening. And I think the burden would be on those who say we shouldn't have competition and those who say that the status quo would be okay if we had only one contractor.

Now, the other point I want to make beyond money is about the operational capacity of our Armed Forces. The United States enjoys the blessing of

military superiority this evening I think for two essential reasons. The first and most important one is the quality of the young men and women who volunteer to serve us. Without question, that's the most important reason. But the second, I believe, is our superiority in the air, our ability in any corner of the globe to establish dominance over the battle space by virtue of the quality of our air assets.

The operability of those air assets, as Mr. HUNTER just mentioned a few minutes ago, is at risk if we are dependent upon one supply chain, one manufacturing process, one set of parts, and one set of solutions to a problem. You always want to have a plan B. This would be a difficult call if having that plan B operationally cost us more money, but it isn't a difficult call because the opposite is true. Having the plan B, having the option, saves money for the American taxpayer. The GAO has estimated about \$21 billion over time because of the merits and benefits of choice and competition.

We have two fine enterprises involved with these engines, and I think what we ought to do is create a system where each flourishes, not because of the benefits of the job creation that will occur—although that's certainly a welcome benefit—but because operationally, this is the best way to support those who serve us. This is the best way to avoid putting them at risk because of operational defects and because the benefits and merits of competition over time will reduce pressure on our taxpayers to the tune of \$21 billion.

I thank the Chair for his collegial work on this subject, and I would urge Members to defeat this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. 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. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. CONAWAY, 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.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 514, EXTENDING COUNTERTERRORISM AUTHORITIES

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-14) on the resolution (H. Res. 93) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 514) to extend expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 and Intel-

ligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 relating to access to business records, individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers, and roving wiretaps until December 8, 2011, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 92 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1.

□ 2008

##### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of 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, with Mr. CONAWAY (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 2, offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY), was pending.

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

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

Mr. CHABOT. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as we debate the funding of a competing engine for the Joint Strike Fighter Program, there are a few key points that we should keep in mind.

First, competition has long been the best way to control costs on large defense programs, and competition is the centerpiece of acquisition reform. By funding competing engines for the Joint Strike Fighter, we can save \$21 billion. Let me repeat that, \$21 billion savings in taxpayer money over time according to the Government Accountability Office.

□ 2010

Beyond the GAO's projections, our recent history demonstrates that competition also leads to a more efficient process, quicker innovation, and better contractor responsiveness. Recently, the Quadrennial Defense Review Independent Panel concluded, "History has shown that the only reliable source of price reduction through the life of a program is competition between dual sources." Additionally, the absence of competition makes it harder to address the issues that inevitably arise in connection with sophisticated and critical technology, such as jet engines.

Mr. Chairman, we are seeing such issues on the lead engine for the Joint Strike Fighter. Pratt & Whitney was

designated to power the JSF aircraft under the theory that it could effectively derive an engine from its engine for the F-22. Unfortunately, it wasn't as easy as they had anticipated. As a result, the lead engine for the Joint Strike Fighter is now billions of dollars over budget and, worse, struggling to perform the critical functional requirements for the aircraft.

I quote directly from the GAO report from March 2010: "The Pratt engine is now estimated to cost about \$7.3 billion, a 50 percent increase over the original contract award. The total projected cost increased \$800 million in 2008. Engine development cost increases primarily resulted from higher costs for labor and materials, supplier problems, and the rework needed to correct deficiencies with an engine blade during redesign. Engine test problems have also slowed development."

The GAO further confirmed an additional total project cost increase of \$1.2 billion in 2010 alone to cover higher than expected engine costs, tooling, and other items. And on February 11, 2011, yet another cost overrun on the lead engine was announced, this time totaling at least \$1 billion, bringing total cost overruns on the lead engine to an astounding \$3.5 billion today.

The Department of Defense says we don't need a second engine, but these issues won't fix themselves. Only competition will help control costs and create a better, more efficient process. I ask you, How can we afford not to invest in a competing engine? Bottom line, having the engine makers fight head-to-head will give us a far more capable, more cost effective Joint Strike Fighter.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. COURTNEY. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the gentleman from Florida's amendment. And as a fellow member of the House Armed Services Committee, I just want to share at least some of the ad nauseam length of input that we have had at the Armed Services Committee over the last 2 or 3 years talking about this issue.

We have had the benefit of hearing from the warfighters, the heads of the various branches that are dealing with this program, whether it's the Marines, the Navy, the Air Force, and they have repeatedly, over the last 2 or 3 years, stated that there is no justification for this wasteful spending which, again, both the President and the Secretary of Defense have also supported.

On the Seapower Subcommittee, which I serve on, Admiral Roughead, the CNO, head of the Navy, talked about the disastrous operational impact that having two engines would have in terms of our aircraft carriers. As he stated: "One can look at a carrier and see a very large ship, but when