

the United States in that region of the world, it is time for you to take stock. If you have been a supporter of this administration, it is time for you to take stock in that support. Is it justified? Is it realistic? Is it what you really believe? Because if you believe what this administration believes, then you believe that the only answer is for Israel to continue to give, to give of itself to its neighbors who hate it, who are continually trying to destroy it, who refuse after all these years—1947—after all these years, continue to refuse as a matter of just negotiation to acknowledge Israel's right to exist as a state.

How much longer will it take, Mr. Speaker? How many more years until these other organizations—you know, the taxpayers, the United States taxpayers, fund the Palestinian Authority and their effort to pay stipends to prisoners who blow up Israelis, who blow them up. It is seen as their job. It is like a paycheck. If you go to prison, you get paid for doing it, and the more heinous it is, the more you get paid.

Yet, somehow Israel is supposed to turn the other cheek yet again and give of itself to people that blow it up. Even after they give, let's face it, after they give, because they have offered to give time and time and time again, we all know, Mr. Speaker, it is not going to be enough. Because the people that call Jews and Israel descendants of apes and dogs and pigs, they are not going to stop thinking that just because Israel agrees to whatever concession they demand. They won't stop until there is no Israel. That is their goal. That has been their stated goal, and it hasn't changed.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to again highlight to anybody that has supported this administration because of their support for Israel, see what it is, look it in the face. It has shown itself finally for what it truly is. It is not support of Israel, it is support of a political agenda that makes Israel continue to bleed, and it is unacceptable for the United States of America to turn its back on this longstanding ally.

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

**REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4486, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4487, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015**

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-426) on the resolution (H. Res. 557) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4486) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4487) making ap-

propriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**PATENT TRANSPARENCY ACT**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to warn the American people that fundamental changes are being proposed in our legal system here in Washington that could have a dramatic impact on their freedom, a dramatic impact on the prosperity of this country, and a dramatic impact on the security of our country.

These changes that I am talking about are not so apparent to the average person because they deal with a very complicated issue of technology and technology ownership. I have been in Congress for about 25 years—actually 26 years at the end of this year. During that time period, there has been an ongoing fight that has not been recognized by many American people.

It is the fight to maintain a very strong patent system in our country. It has been ongoing because major players around the world, especially multinational corporations, have not been supportive of the idea that the American people have a right to own their own creations. In fact, our Founding Fathers felt that this was so important that we have the patent rights and copyrights for the average American person that they wrote it into our Constitution. I just happen to have a copy of the Constitution here.

Article I, section 8 says one of the powers of Congress is “to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.” This is what our Founding Fathers wrote into the Constitution. This is the body of the Constitution. This is before the Declaration of Independence.

Our Founding Fathers were so much in favor of this concept where people would own what they created, and that would spur the creativity and the genius of people and that would uplift all of humankind, they were so much engaged in that concept they wrote it into our Constitution and put it on par thus above the Bill of Rights in terms of speech, religion, and other rights.

People like Benjamin Franklin, who is one of our great Founding Fathers, a technologist at heart, knew this is the way we would be the shining light of the world where ordinary people would be able to live well. Jefferson—go to Monticello and see—he himself was an inventor. Yes, he was the first administrator of the U.S. Patent Office.

The intellectual property rights that our people have enjoyed over the years

have been one of America's greatest assets. They have provided ordinary people throughout the world a chance to live decent lives, have jobs in which they can own homes, have jobs that will create wealth. It wasn't because our American people work harder. People work hard all over the world. All over the world you have people struggling and working so hard, but they don't have freedom and they don't have technology. It is the freedom to create technology and the utilization of that technology by ordinary people that expands the creation of wealth so that ordinary people can live well.

Tonight, I would like to alert the American people: one of the fundamental elements laid down by our Founding Fathers that would help us create this wonderful country of freedom and prosperity for ordinary people, it is now being threatened, it is being threatened by a concerted attack by large, huge corporations, multinational corporations, who do not have loyalty to the American people at their heart.

Let me note that today, after fighting this fight for 26 years, the first fight that we were in dealt with, they were going to put an amendment on the gap implementation legislation, which is a treaty laying down the rules for trade around the world. The provisions they were going to put in would have reversed the basic tenets of our patent system.

That is, number one, they were going to say that if you apply for a patent, after 18 months, whether or not that patent is issued to you, it is going to be published for the whole world to see. That is what they were trying to foist on us. I called it the Steal American Technologies Act.

Today, if you apply for a patent, that is top secret. In fact, if somebody in the Patent Office leaks that information they can be put in jail for a felony. But they wanted to change that because the rest of the world—Europe and Japan—has that system and they want to globalize our rights, especially our patent rights.

□ 1745

They said they were going to eliminate it so that, after 18 months, they would just publish it. We fought that back—MARCY KAPTUR, who is a Democrat, and I. On both sides of the aisle, we had people fighting this, and we beat the big guys.

Unfortunately, over the years, we have had three or four of these fights. Sometimes, we have lost; and sometimes, we have won. Once again, we are talking about people who have come to the floor to reform the patent system. They always use the word “reform” when, in reality, they are trying to destroy the fundamentals of a strong American patent system.

The last patent reform bill was the America Invents Act, which just went into effect last year. The patent lawyers and courts and innovators are still

trying to figure out what the implications are of the changes that we made in the last Congress. However, we have to recognize that that bill itself was the most sweeping in changes to the American patent system in the history of our country.

Now, even before we see how that is going to impact America and the American people, they are trying to shove another one through. It actually has gone through the House. Even before we are able to judge the effects of the last Congress' America Invents Act, another bill—that is H.R. 3309, the Innovation Act—was rammed through the House last December.

Its companion bill, S. 1720, the Patent Transparency and Improvements Act—all of these sound so good, don't they—right now is being considered in the United States Senate.

Prudence and good judgment suggest that Congress should move forward slowly and see how at least the last bill that we put in place is working. If it is phase one, let's wait for phase two, to see how phase one is working. Perhaps we should take time to see if there are unintended consequences.

By the way, there are unintended consequences, but I am here to say to the American people today that there are intended consequences to these changes. The intended consequences are to diminish the patent protection that has been afforded the American people since the founding of our country—to diminish your rights to own the technologies you have developed. It is a great threat to our people.

This onslaught has been under the guise of being pro-patent and pro-inventor. They use those words over and over again when, in reality, this is cynical, and it is being proposed by huge corporations—multinational corporations—that despise the little guy because he is demanding to be paid when his technology discoveries are being used.

Instead, of course, what we have is a globalist effort to neuter the patent rights of the American people, the patent rights that we have had—the strongest patent system since our Constitution was written. In the whole world, we have the strongest patent system. This antipatent juggernaut has been organized and financed by megacompanies, by mega-multinational companies.

The public and, yes, my colleagues haven't had time to fully understand the implications of this power play that has been ongoing, especially the power play that we see now on the part of the electronic industry giants like Google; yet a vote approaches in the Senate which could take us down a road which will be hostile to American innovation, a road from which we will never return.

The vote in the Senate should be and must be postponed. The American people need to speak to their Senators and let them know that they expect the Senate patent bill to be postponed—

maybe, perhaps, until next year—while we get a chance to look and see what is in this bill and what impact it will have on the American people.

Right now, as I say, some huge corporate interests are on the verge of being given power—that is what this bill would do—to steal the creative genius and innovation of American technology entrepreneurs and inventors.

What will this do to the United States? This may help those big companies for a little while, but in the long run, it will undercut the well-being, the standard of living, the prosperity that we have for average Americans here.

How could this be? How could this be happening? Why would we give up our freedom and undercut our competitiveness?

The big boys have set out to scare us into giving up our freedom. They have set out to create some horrible threat—the sound of which is very sinister—that will let us put restrictions on the ownership of intellectual property, which we know is America's greatest asset, yet we are going to go along with it because there is some threat to that.

Twenty-five years ago, they called it the submarine patent. Oh, how horrible that was going to be, in that it was going to undercut our competitiveness. Of course, it proved to be nothing, zero.

Today, the patent battle is supposedly aimed at patent trolls. This sinister sounding classification refers to scam artists who are using patent infringement claims to extort money from innocent small business men and small business owners. Yes, some of that happens in our country.

Throughout our economy, you will find lawyers who are threatening lawsuits that are not substantive, but that are aimed at forcing victims to pay and face exorbitant legal fees in order to get them off their backs.

Of course, that is a frivolous lawsuit. It is throughout our system, and it is something that, unfortunately, the average businessman in America and businesswoman in America has to put up with.

Frivolous lawsuits have plagued every portion of our society. Every businessman, doctor, lawyer—you name it—throughout our society is affected by frivolous lawsuits, but this only focuses on, supposedly, frivolous lawsuits by inventors.

How come they are being singled out? How come they have to make sure that we have to change the rules of the game, so there won't be frivolous lawsuits by inventors, as compared to all of the other frivolous lawsuits?

That is because this legislation that is going through Congress treats all inventors as if they are scam artists. You see, there aren't any legitimate lawsuits by these guys against inventors. Every one of them is a scam artist.

In order to get those scam artists, they have got to eliminate or dramatically reduce the ability of small inven-

tors to protect their inventions. This bill, of course, is a reversal of the frivolous lawsuit scam.

Interestingly enough, what we have here are large corporate interests that want to steal the inventions and inventiveness of our little guys by making it too expensive and complicated for them to protect their rights through our judicial process.

Of course, they are not going to tell you that is their goal, but that is what it is. They are trying to shackle the little guy, so he can't protect his own rights. In the legislation making its way through Congress, the terms "patent troll" and "patent assertion entity" and "non-practicing entity" are all lumped together.

This is the evil. This is, obviously, a semblance of a wrongdoing by someone and is certainly not a legitimate property right for these people to be bringing these suits. That is what we are being told.

The legislation, however, doesn't limit just frivolous lawsuits. In fact, it doesn't limit frivolous lawsuits at all. It limits lawsuits by every inventor. It weakens the position of every inventor in relationship to a large corporation that is involved with arrogantly trying to steal that inventor's patent rights without paying the little guy.

It is the little guy who created these things, and this law that we are putting through in the name of getting the patent troll basically cuts the ground out from the people who we have most to be grateful for, the inventors of this country, who have come up with the technology that has created the wealth and the freedom that we have here and the security that we have here.

This battle is the ultimate David versus Goliath, and I am sorry to say that the Congress of the United States seems to be on the side of Goliath. After all of these years of fighting this battle, MARCY KAPTUR and I—Democrats and Republicans on both sides of the aisle—now find with this legislation on behalf of one huge, mammoth company—the "Goliath Google gang" we can call them—that they have greased the skids.

With the power play, of course, we have to recognize they have greased the skids. They have gotten a lot of them. They have gone way down the road on this, but they are not unstoppable, and it is not irreversible yet, but if the Senate passes the bill, that is probably the point of no return.

However, we do have a chance. They have overplayed their hand, and that is often what happens when companies become too arrogant. In this case, the universities, which are not helpless and without supporters as compared to the small inventors—the little guys in their garages or the small inventors—have been put at risk by this legislation.

Science and research departments of educational institutions create new things all the time. They have patents that they apply for and get all the time

because they are involved almost on a full-time basis of pushing back the boundaries and the understanding of knowledge that would help us create new technologies.

They deserve to reap the rewards from these discoveries. They deserve to have the benefit of patents. Our Founding Fathers knew this would be a great source of wealth for institutions that invested in creating new ideas.

Yes, they have many patents that are not practiced, which means the universities just develop the new technology, but they don't practice it. They don't try to commercialize it. Guess what? That makes them patent trolls, by the definition of the legislation. According to the patent legislation, they are patent trolls. Our universities become patent trolls.

In fact, if this legislation passes in the Senate and if it is enacted into law, much of the value of the patents held by America's universities will evaporate. It will be the most damaging hit ever taken by university-based science in the history of our country.

Google, however, will be doing just fine. Our universities may take a big hit, but Google will be doing fine, along with these other multinational corporations.

If this becomes law, small businesses will be forced to sue in order to defend their patents, and they will find that the process is more costly, more risky, less certain.

Investors will stop investing in small companies, by the way. They will stop investing and trying if someone comes to them with a good idea, and they will require a greater return for their investments if someone is trying to help an innovator or a technologist develop his or her idea.

Their risks will be increased, so that any investor will demand more of a return. This will destroy the small and independent inventors, but these big companies don't care. What they care about is taking anything they can get their hands on and using it without paying the inventor.

In the past, we have had an effort by the corporations to eliminate what you call triple damages. Triple damages are if someone comes to them and says—or if one is informed or if it can be proven that one is aware that they are using patented technology and not paying a royalty to the inventor of that technology, they can be sued for triple damages.

They tried to take this away. The reason the corporations wanted to take it away was that you could never get a lawyer to work for you on contingency if you were only going to get your equal damages paid for, but if you have got triple damages, a lawyer could be called in to help defend the little guy against the big guy. They tried their best to get this taken out.

Now, why are they doing that? Why is a big corporation doing that? They are doing it because they don't want to pay that little guy. What has happened

is that because they couldn't get the triple damages taken out—that is something that MARCY KAPTUR and I defeated—they have found a way around it.

Before, when a company was developing a new type of video screen or electronic device, if there were a new chip or something that needed to be included, there would be a patent search to go and see if they were stepping on somebody's toes. That was part of what they did. That was part of the process.

It was a costly part, but it made sure that everybody's rights were protected. They didn't go forward in building something without notifying the patent owner and working out a deal with him or her.

That is not the way it is anymore. These big corporations that we are talking about instruct their engineers and their scientists: don't do a patent search because, if you don't do a patent search, they can't prove that we knew that this was invented by somebody else; thus, we don't have triple damages.

This is as cynical as it gets, but yet we have Members of the House who come to the floor and defend these corporate scavengers, who defend these big guys who are trying to step on little Americans. They defend them because—guess what—these are powerful players; and, yes, Google has given enormous amounts of money politically over the years in order to make sure people listen to them.

I am not saying people are bought by them, but they have laid the foundation, and now, Congress is listening to them. That is why that bill passed.

□ 1800

The American people have to counter that. We counter that by making sure our voice is heard, by making sure that the voice of the little guy is heard, by making sure that the people who believe in the Constitution of the United States, that their voices are heard over some mega-multinational corporation board members who are out wining and dining people.

We can turn this around. America has proven that freedom works if the American people are willing to work at it. But we have had the fundamentals working for us. We have had a patent system and a Constitution working for us.

So what we need to do, and if indeed there is a problem with trolls, let's admit to these corporations, yes, there are some frivolous lawsuits in your area of the economy. Just like in all the other areas of the economy, there are frivolous lawsuits by people who shouldn't be filing them, who are trying just to get paid off because the cost of the litigation will be so high.

Okay. We admit that to them. Let's say, Let's fix that problem. Let's go and just fix the problem of frivolous lawsuits, and let's make sure that if there is a frivolous lawsuit, it is easier for people to counteract a frivolous

lawsuit in the technology. If they want to do it just for technology people, fine. It hurts everybody, but we should do it for everybody. But fine, if they have got the ear of the Congress now, let's work and change that law, the laws that will then make it easier to counteract the frivolous lawsuits by these sinister people, the trolls that are aimed at putting pressure on when it really isn't legitimate. We can do that.

The legislation that has passed here last year and the legislation in the Senate does just the opposite. It only focuses on all inventors, on regular people who are doing things and creating things themselves, not trolls.

What it is is the old theory of how we are going to make America under different countries better. This is way back when our country was being founded we had to decide: Are we going have a system in which the government can control everybody in order to prevent the bad people from doing things or are we going to give everybody freedom and then really punish the bad people?

This legislation that we have now before us and what has just passed the House and is now lingering in the Senate is an attempt to supposedly control the bad people in our country by controlling all of us, by making rules that will take away the rights of every inventor. No. No, that is not what you do. That is inconsistent with American tradition, inconsistent with our Constitution, inconsistent with what our Founding Fathers had in mind.

Let's go down and say: What specifically, if you have frivolous lawsuits coming at large electronic corporations, how can we handle that without undermining the rights of those inventors who are coming up with the apps and the new creations, the three-dimensional printers and the wonderful things that we are on the verge of today?

That is not going to happen unless the American people rise up. That is not going to happen unless the voice of these giants, these Goliaths of the industrial world, Google and the rest of them who are now rampaging and stepping on the rights of individual American inventors, unless we speak up, unless our voice is heard at least as loud as theirs, we are going lose our freedom. We are going to lose our edge.

It has been the American technology and our inventiveness over the years that has made us a secure country. It is the technology that we have developed for our Nation's defense. You take away the patent rights of our American people, we will neuter that and we will be vulnerable, you take away the patent protections that we have had for our inventors that have come up with newer ways to compete.

How can American workers compete with a world filled with cheap labor? I will tell you how we can do it. We can make sure they have the best technology and the newest ideas and are

the greatest innovators, because they can outcompete people who are working just with their muscles and their sweat. We can do that, but that is not the direction our government is going in. That is not the direction our multinational corporations want us to go in.

Let me alert you, we have a bill in the Senate. If it passes the Senate, it will totally undermine the little guys, the independent inventors. It will undermine the universities. It will undermine everybody but the big multinational electronics corporations. That needs to be thwarted.

Something else is happening. Something again is being snuck through, just like they tried to sneak through 25 years ago in the gap implementation legislation. The gap is, again, a trade treaty we are getting into to try to do this where we would publish all of America's patent applications even before they were issued to our inventors. They tried that.

The other thing they tried to do was what? Was if someone applies for a patent, that at that moment the clock starts ticking and 20 years later they have no more patent protection. Of course, until their patent is issued, they have no patent protection anyway. Quite often patents take 5 to 10 years. Plus, they are cutting in half the time the inventor has for patent protection. They are trying to push that through. We stopped that.

Well, guess what? We now have several trade treaties that people are negotiating for this Congress. Look real close at what is happening. These big multinational corporations, from what I understand, are trying to put provisions into those trade treaties that will change the fundamental law of intellectual property rights here in this country.

Beware. Be aware and beware of what will happen if that comes about. You put this into a treaty. It snuck through. They tried to do that in gap, and it took a Herculean effort on the part of a few of us to try to stop that 20 years ago.

With that said, I would like to put into the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, at this point a list of those things that would be very detrimental to the small inventor that are provisions of the bill that is now in the Senate.

PATENT TRANSPARENCY PROVISIONS

It would create a new requirement that a patent holder must, once filing a claim for infringement, provide information about all parties with an interest in the patent to the patent office, the court, and the accused infringer.

This means the elimination of privacy in business dealings. The little guy is totally exposed as his friends and suppliers will be as well. The patent holder will be forced to provide a list of potential "bank accounts to raid" to the accused infringers.

In addition, once this requirement has been invoked, the patent holder must maintain a current record of the information on file at the patent office or forfeit their rights. That means a patent holder gains a new bureaucratic reporting requirement, dramatically increasing the vulnerability of

the small inventor and investors. This just because they reported an infringement of their intellectual property rights.

In addition, the patent holder gains a new bureaucratic fee by being forced to pay recordkeeping fees to maintain their current record at the patent office.

These are minor inconveniences to multinational corporations, but will be of killer significant burden on the little guy.

CUSTOMER STAY PROVISIONS

The Patent Transparency Act also enables large multi-national corporations to create nested "shell companies" which have few assets, but can infringe on patents while the inventor is unable to sue their "customers" who are free to continue infringing the patent while the first court case moves through the system. This process could keep an infringing process in place for a decade or more while an inventor, if he has the resources, tries to stop it.

SMALL BUSINESS EDUCATION, OUTREACH, AND INFORMATION ACCESS PROVISIONS

The Patent Transparency Act authorizes the patent office Director to create a "patent troll" database, and to create a strategy program to teach small businesses how to defend themselves from "patent trolls."

So we will be encouraging the Director of the patent office to create an "enemies list" and a strategy guide for infringers to undermine patent rights.

The ultimate results of this legislation will be: increased patent infringement, reduced legal remedies for those being infringed, reduced investments in small business, and irreparable damage to our research universities, our inventors, our entrepreneurs, our economy, and our nation.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, so I would suggest that the American people read this and take a look at what the impact of these changes that they are proposing will be. They are going to claim it is a patent troll and there is a monitor behind the curtain, but who that person is behind the curtain is the inventor, the person who is coming up with the invention, the Edisons, the Teslas, and the other people who have improved our standard of living. The people who have come up—even this bill would have a serious impact on the development of new medicines and new health care technologies. These people need to be protected in their creation and encouraged, not controlled and not have their rights for ownership of what they created be trimmed.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of him assisting with the emergency response to the tornadoes in Arkansas.

Mr. RICHMOND (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for April 28 and today on account of attending to family matters.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, April 29, 2014.

AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2015 BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. RYAN OF WISCONSIN. Mr. Speaker, section 115 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, Public Law 113-67, requires the chairs of the House and Senate Budget Committees to submit for printing in the Congressional Record committee allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels for fiscal year 2015.

Pursuant to section 115 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record: (1) an allocation for fiscal year 2015 for the House Committee on Appropriations, (2) allocations for fiscal years 2015 and 2015 through 2024 for committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, (3) aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2015, and (4) aggregate revenue levels for fiscal years 2015 and 2015 through 2024.

In the case of allocations for committees other than the Committee on Appropriations and for the revenue aggregates, the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 provides that the levels shall be consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's most recent baseline, adjusted to account for any legislation enacted since the date the most recent baseline was issued. In other words, in these instances, the new allocations and levels are set equal to the most recent baseline.

The committee allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels included in this submission are set pursuant to the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013. The provisions of H. Con. Res. 25 (113th Congress), as deemed in force by section 113 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, Public Law 113-67, remain in force to the extent its budgetary levels are not superseded by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 or subsequent action of the House of Representatives.

Associated tables are attached. These committee allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels are made for the purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and other budgetary enforcement provisions.

If there are any questions on these committee allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels please contact Paul Restuccia, Chief Counsel of the Budget Committee, at 202-226-7270.

Sincerely,  
PAUL D. RYAN OF WISCONSIN,  
Chairman, House Budget Committee.

FISCAL YEAR 2015 BUDGET TOTALS  
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 2015	Fiscal years 2015–2024
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority .....	3,025,306	n.a.
Outlays .....	3,025,032	n.a.
Revenues .....	2,533,388	31,202,135

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2016 through 2024 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS  
(in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 2015
Base Discretionary Action:	
BA .....	1,013,628
OT .....	1,141,432
Global War on Terrorism:	
BA .....	85,357