

with our ally Israel. Until we hold those who seek to destroy Israel accountable, it will always be a tough time for our closest ally.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of Colorado). The Republican leader is recognized.

#### CHANGING COURSE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, there has been a lot of debate in the past week about the latest proposals coming out of the White House, about whether the President's latest stimulus bill or the tax hikes he is proposing will help or hurt the economy. But based on what we are hearing from the White House this week, it is hard to see the point in having any debate at all.

I am referring, of course, to a comment by the White House Communications Director who told the New York Times on Monday that the President had entered what he referred to as a new phase—a new phase. He said the President may have worked with Republicans to avert a government shutdown last spring and to raise the debt ceiling this summer, but “that phase is behind us.” In other words, the White House isn't interested in actually accomplishing anything anymore. It is more interested in making a point than making a difference.

So here is my question: How do you explain to the 14 million Americans looking for a job right now that you are more interested in motivating campaign supporters than in motivating businesses to hire?

For the past week, the President has been running around the country trying to set a record for the number of times he can say pass this bill “right away” in a 5-minute stump speech. Meanwhile, his communications director is telling people the President doesn't expect the bill to pass. And the Democratic majority leader in the Senate is treating it like a legislative afterthought. My friend the majority leader said yesterday he might take up this supposedly “urgent” bill next month after he has had a chance to deal with a Chinese currency bill and a few others. As for the other Democrats in Congress, well, they are not exactly rushing to get it in the queue either.

This so-called jobs bill seems to be about as popular as Solyndra, and I am just talking about among Democrats. Yet the President is out there acting as

though somebody is actually putting up a fight. So this whole thing is a charade, and I think the American people deserve better. I think they deserve a President who realizes that governing involves working with a situation as it is, not as you would like it to be. President Obama may think the best way to distract people from the challenges we face is to stand near a bridge in a swing State and pit one group of Americans against another and hope his critics look bad if they don't go along with him, but I don't think he is fooling anybody. I don't think all the campaign stops in the world are going to convince most Americans that the real cause of our problems lies anywhere other than with the policies that are coming out of Washington these days or that the single greatest obstacle to job creation in America today is policies that punish the risk takers and the entrepreneurs and that stifle investment and private enterprise, rather than rewarding it.

When it comes right down to it, I think most Americans care more about results than about rhetoric. Let's be honest. The results of this President's economic policies speak for themselves. After 2½ years of government spending, here is what we have: record deficits, chronic unemployment, median incomes going down, poverty rates going up, and the first ever credit downgrade. This isn't exactly a record to be proud of. So I can understand the President wanting to change the topic. It might make him feel better. It might energize his strongest supporters. But here is something it won't do: It won't create jobs.

Look, if we can solve our jobs crisis and revive the economy by passing the hat at Warren Buffett's annual shareholders meeting, we would have done it by now, but we can't. Why? Because that is not a real solution. It is a campaign slogan.

The President said the other day the tax hikes he is proposing aren't class warfare. He said they are math. Well, we can do math too, so let's do the math. According to the IRS, if you doubled—doubled—the tax burden on everybody in America who earned more than \$1 million in 2009, you would cover the cost of about 3 months of deficit spending around here. If you doubled the tax burden on everybody in America who earned more than \$1 million in 2009, you would cover the cost of about 3 months of the deficit we are running around here. If you confiscated every dime of taxable income from those the President refers to as millionaires and billionaires—take it all—you wouldn't even cover a single year of deficit spending in Washington right now. Spending more money in Washington won't solve our spending problem, it will enable it.

How about the stimulus? One of the programs in the stimulus was supposed to create 65,000 jobs. So far, it has created 3,500 at nearly \$11 million per job—\$11 million per job. Solyndra was

supposed to create thousands of permanent jobs. Two years later, more than 1,000 Solyndra employees are out of work altogether, and the American taxpayer is on the hook for more than \$½ billion in loans to the company.

But here is the most important calculation: Not a single new job will come about as a result of the tax hikes the President proposed this week—not one new job. As the National Federation of Independent Business puts it:

New tax increases on America's biggest job creators are the last thing this economy needs to get back on track.

What else do we need to know?

Republicans are ready to work with the President on turning this economy around. We know what would work, and after the past 2½ years, we have certainly seen what won't work. So my suggestion to the President is the same now as it has been for months. Put aside the political playbook and work with us on policies that will actually solve the problems Americans care about the most. Let's work together on policies that are aimed at motivating job creators, not your political base. It is time to change course.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

#### THE AUTHORIZATION PROCESS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a fundamental problem of this body: the fact that Congress as an institution—and the Senate in particular—rarely engages in the process of authorizing prior to appropriating money for our government. As a result, a handful of senior appropriators and their unelected staffs dictate the spending of hundreds of billions of dollars, often in a manner that directly contravenes the will of those committees that still authorize spending. It is time this process be stopped.

The solution is simple. We should not authorize on appropriations bills, and any funding proposed for unauthorized projects should be subject to the scrutiny and approval of the authorizing committees and reflect the will of their members.

We are all to blame for this problem. The fact is that routine passage of authorizing legislation simply doesn't occur as it should. Far too often, even routine passage of appropriations legislation has devolved into passage of a

single omnibus bill. This also must stop.

A case in point is the appropriations bill to fund the Department of Defense that was reported out of the Appropriations Committee last week. That legislation should reflect the will of the Defense authorization bill but runs directly contrary to it in many areas. At a time when we face a \$14.7 trillion national debt that is mortgaging the future of our children and grandchildren, the Senate Appropriations Committee is proposing a Defense spending bill that uses a budget gimmick totaling over \$10 billion to mislead the American people about the savings the committee claims to achieve.

While the Department of Defense is struggling to find more than \$400 billion in cuts directed by the President, the Appropriations Committee is still conducting business as usual by rewarding special interests and funding pet projects that have little or nothing to do with our national defense. In the bill reported out last week that purports to cut over \$26 billion from the President's request by changes to 580 different programs, somehow the Appropriations Committee still found money for over \$2.3 billion in additional spending not requested by the Department of Defense and for items that are far from real defense requirements.

I have here a list of the roughly 580 items changed by the Appropriations Committee which are differences from the bill adopted unanimously by the Senate Armed Services Committee in June in the Department of Defense authorization bill. This list is 45 pages long and represents \$20 billion in changes.

For example, it is incredible to me the Appropriations Committee put a priority on spending \$33 million in operation and maintenance funds. That money is used to maintain the readiness and combat capability of our troops. The \$33 million is going to purchase schoolbuses, to build a mental health substance abuse facility on Guam, and a repository for cultural artifacts. I am not making that up: \$33 million for a repository—oh, phase one of a repository for cultural artifacts, funding for a mental health substance abuse facility, and the purchase of schoolbuses. All of this money, and \$40 million more next year to complete these facilities, is, at least in theory, supposedly, to help promote Guam's cooperation as part of the plan to move 8,700 marines and 9,000 family members from their current bases on Okinawa to Guam.

I know the marines will enjoy being on Guam. I am not sure it is absolutely necessary for them to have a repository for cultural artifacts. But the plan to move the marines, which will require spending between \$18 billion and \$23 billion on Guam to build up its capabilities as a permanent base, is so much in doubt that both the Armed Services Committee and the Military

Construction and Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee have stopped funding Guam military construction projects until the Department of Defense provides a master plan and considers alternatives that may provide the needed marine forward presence at much less expense.

In fact, we simply cannot afford to carry out the plans as they were originally envisioned. In the face of all the doubt about the scope and timing of the eventual buildup, the Appropriations Committee put a premium on buying schoolbuses, an artifact repository, and a mental health clinic in Guam. That is not anybody's idea of defense priorities in the fiscal environment we face.

In some cases, the Appropriations Committee was well aware that the Armed Services Committee had, on a unanimous vote, reported out a bill that denied funding for a program, but the appropriators funded the full amount anyway. This is the case with the Army's Medium Extended Air Defense System, or MEADS. The Armed Services Committee cut the entire budget request of \$406 million for this program because Army leaders have told the Senate they do not intend to ever buy or deploy the system and because repeated technical reviews have determined that MEADS is behind schedule, over cost, and a high risk of technical failure. The Appropriations Committee ignored the Armed Services Committee's decision not to authorize further funding for MEADS and instead appropriated the full amount of \$406 million—even in the face of the fact of the need to cut defense spending by eliminating troubled programs that are not effectively providing increased combat capability for the troops.

Additionally, hundreds of millions of dollars in the fiscal year 2012 Defense appropriations bill have been allocated to things that were never requested by the Pentagon, never authorized by the Senate Armed Services Committee, and which are simply not core defense priorities.

Example: There is \$354 million added for medical research not requested by the Pentagon, including \$120 million for breast cancer research, \$10 million for ovarian cancer research, \$64 million for prostate cancer research, and \$50 million for other medical research for a laundry list of medical conditions. I am not questioning the merits of medical research, but they do not have anything to do with defending this Nation. They should be taken out of the appropriations of the Health and Human Services Subcommittee, not out of defense.

Again, I am not questioning the merits of medical research and the important role the Federal Government can play. I am saying it is time for it to stop being taken out of national defense.

The Appropriations Committee adds even more unrequested funding for programs such as \$60 million for environ-

mental conservation for ranges; \$106 million for alternate energy research, whatever that means; \$45 million for high-performance computing modernization—all of these, and a long list of them, may be good programs; they are not authorized; and the job of the Senate Armed Services Committee is to scrutinize these programs and select those that are in most need of funding—\$5 million for the National Guard Youth Challenge Program; \$4.5 million for the Civil Air Patrol.

Programs have some merit, but we have to look at these with an eye to the fact that we have been tasked to cut \$400 billion that the President has already ordered the Pentagon to undertake.

Despite the Appropriations Committee's desire to find \$26 billion in defense savings, they found money to add \$240 million in unrequested funding—the Pentagon and the President did not ask for them—for a number of congressional special interest areas, such as advanced materials research, \$10 million; Industrial Base Innovation Fund—whatever that is—\$30 million; Defense Rapid Innovation Fund, \$200 million.

In the procurement account, the Appropriations Committee added \$675 million for items that were not requested by the Pentagon or authorized by the Armed Services Committee, including \$120 million for advance procurement of 12 Air Force C-130Js, \$47.4 million for improved radars for Air National Guard F-15s, \$140 million for program increases to classified programs—the list goes on and on.

Although the appropriators were looking for \$26 billion in savings, they chose not to follow the Armed Services Committee in making cuts to some programs even when the justification for taking savings was clear. These examples include \$150 million for the Army Guided Multiple Launch Rocket System; \$495 million for Navy F/A-18E/F Hornets, which the Armed Services Committee pointed out were funded in the full-year Defense appropriations bill for the year 2011; \$205 million for the Fleet Satellite Communications follow-on program, for which the Government Accountability Office and the Armed Services Committee noted that the funding for the requested booster was too early.

In order to give the appearance of real savings to the taxpayer, the Appropriations Committee, again, incredibly, shifted over \$10 billion in funding from the nonwar base defense funding budget to the "off-budget/emergency spending." For the benefit of the record, the Overseas Contingency Operations Fund does not count as part of the budget, but it is for overseas contingencies, i.e., the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

So what did the Appropriations Committee do? They took money that is supposed to be for the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, and they transferred over \$3.2 billion to the account for

overseas contingency operations, \$550 million for predator drones, \$228 million for Fire Scout unmanned aerial systems, \$784 million for unmanned aerial systems.

In the operations and maintenance accounts, the Appropriations Committee transferred over \$6.2 billion for items that were requested in the base budget to the “off-budget” overseas contingency operations funding, including \$3 billion for Army depot maintenance, \$495 million for Navy depot maintenance—it goes on and on.

In the military personnel accounts, another \$529 million was transferred from the defense budget, where it was requested, to the overseas contingency operations budget so it would count as “defense savings.”

This is pure budget gimmickry. It is about time we got serious about cutting spending. Using budget gimmicks to shift over \$10 billion from the base defense budget to the emergency account we have set aside for support of overseas contingency operations is not saving the taxpayers a dime. Cutting \$10 billion from the President’s request for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, shifting over \$10 billion in nonwar expenses, and then claiming in a press release—they had the gall in a press release—that the President’s request for the warfighting accounts is fully supported is not only a gimmick, it is dishonest with the American people. It is a disservice to the men and women of the military who depend on that funding for critical warfighting equipment and support.

I have talked to many of our senior commanders in Iraq and members of the Iraqi Government during repeated trips to Iraq this year. All of them have recommended that the United States maintain at least 10,000 soldiers beyond December 31, 2011. There is no money in the warfighting accounts for, if we have, additional troops. So because of the administration’s delay in any decision for any additional troops, understandably, that is not funded in these bills, which is required, obviously, by October 1, the end of the fiscal year.

What will also put our troops, our national security, and our Nation at grave risk is the specter of even more drastic defense cuts should the recommendations of the joint select committee fail to gather enough congressional support.

Secretary of Defense Panetta warned last week that the failure of lawmakers to agree on debt ceiling talks, which would trigger up to \$600 billion in additional Pentagon budget cuts, could add 1 percentage point to the Nation’s jobless rate. He also called the impact of cuts of that magnitude “devastating” to our Armed Forces.

The citizens of my State—and nearly every other State in the Nation—have been struggling through record unemployment rates and unprecedented fiscal pressures. Now, more than ever,

they need strong leadership to make tough decisions to restore fiscal discipline and responsibility in Federal spending. I am committed to using every power available to me to ensure the Defense bill for 2012 provides spending for only the most critical national security requirements, as proposed by the President and defense leadership. In this regard, the Defense appropriations bill that has been reported from the Appropriations Committee is sadly lacking.

There is plenty of blame to go around. I do not fault just the appropriators. We have all failed to do our jobs. The answer to this problem is to fix it. We must stop authorizing on appropriations legislation without the agreement of the authorizing committee. The appropriations bills should reflect the will of the authorizing committees. I intend to work with my colleagues to remedy this problem so the will and wisdom of all Senators—not just a select few—is represented when we pass appropriations legislation.

A solution to this problem is long overdue, and I intend to fight to see that it is solved.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### EXTENDING THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2832, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2832) to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid (for Casey) amendment No. 633, to extend and modify trade adjustment assistance.

Hatch amendment No. 641 (to amendment No. 633), to make the effective date of the amendments expanding the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program contingent on the enactment of the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act, the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act, and the United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 625 TO AMENDMENT NO. 633

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, No. 625. I

ask unanimous consent that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McCAIN] proposes an amendment numbered 625 to amendment No. 633.

Mr. McCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To extend trade adjustment assistance as in effect before the enactment of the Trade and Globalization Adjustment Assistance of 2009)

Strike title II and insert the following:

#### TITLE II—TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

##### SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.

Title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 et seq.) (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act and without regard to any substitution made by section 1893(b) of the Trade and Globalization Adjustment Assistance Act of 2009 (19 U.S.C. 2271 note prec.)) is amended—

(1) in section 245, by striking “2007” and inserting “2014”;

(2) in section 246(b)(1), by striking “the date that is 5 years” and all that follows through “State” and inserting “December 31, 2014”;

(3) in section 256(b), by striking “each of fiscal years 2003 through 2007, and \$4,000,000 for the 3-month period beginning October 1, 2007” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2012 through 2014, and \$4,000,000 for the 3-month period beginning October 1, 2014”;

(4) in section 285, by striking “2007” each place it appears and inserting “2014”; and

(5) in section 298(a)—  
(A) by striking “2003 through 2007” and inserting “2012 through 2014”; and

(B) by striking “October 1, 2007” and inserting “October 1, 2014”.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, the amendment would authorize the continuation of trade adjustment assistance or TAA for 2 additional years at the level of funding the program maintained prior to the 2009 stimulus package addition. Prior to the stimulus, passed by this body in 2009, the TAA Program cost taxpayers about \$1 billion per year.

The passage of the stimulus package, which was advertised to be a temporary injection into the economy—a temporary injection—the stimulus was increased and expanded to the program at a cost of about \$2 billion in 2010; according to the Department of Labor estimates, \$2.4 billion in 2011, if the stimulus expansions were allowed to remain in place.

I would remind my colleagues that with the stimulus package, these were a one-time deal, and once the money was spent, then those programs lapsed. Apparently not so with the TAA Program. We do not yet have a cost score for the Reid substitute before us, but estimates indicate the TAA agreement may lock in at least 65 percent of the 2009 stimulus expansions for the next several years.