

they know they are going to be in a better position to compete in tough global markets. That means jobs.

I wish to wrap up by talking about tax reform and jobs—and, remember, we have not had fundamental tax reform for a quarter century. For a quarter century, this country has been making almost one tax change a day—almost one tax change a day—thousands and thousands of tax changes cumulatively. Talk about what that means for uncertainty for a business and a consumer. We can make a break with that and do what was done in 1986, which translated into a big boost for our economy.

I wish to give the numbers specifically so folks will see what this tax reform issue is all about. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in the 2 years after the 1986 tax reform bill our country created 6.3 million new jobs. I said 6.3 million new jobs. That sounds pretty good. I think that would go over pretty well at a coffee shop in West Virginia, and it certainly does in Oregon.

I am not going to come to the floor and say every one of those jobs is due to tax reform. There are a host of issues that go into judgments with respect to why consumers buy those appliances and those basic necessities and why businesses invest and hire. But I will tell my colleagues one thing: We couldn't have generated 6.3 million new jobs in the 2 years after the 1986 tax reform bill if we had seen a tax reform proposal enacted that didn't make sense for the American economy. It wouldn't have happened.

Clearly, consumers and businesses believed this was a proposal moved by a Republican President, Ronald Reagan, and a host of very progressive Democrats—folks such as Congressman Dick Gephardt who later ran for President with strong backing of American labor. They came together and created 6.3 million new jobs in 2 years with the kinds of reforms that Senator COATS and former Senator Gregg and Senator BEGICH and I advocate now, that are in line with the fundamental thinking of the Bowles-Simpson proposal, the reforms proposal by former President George Bush, and President Obama's own commission directed by Paul Volcker.

We have a chance now to make fundamental changes—fundamental changes—that will change the direction of our economy and the psychology of the American marketplace. In this debate, we can talk, for example, about the issues that are front and center with American workers. I am certain that in those coffee shops in West Virginia, one of the things that is said again and again is: Senator, make sure you keep the jobs here. Keep them at home. We are tired of all those jobs going offshore.

Senator COATS and I have a proposal that takes away the tax breaks for shipping jobs overseas and uses those dollars to create jobs here at home—

red, white, and blue jobs, jobs that pay good wages here in the United States because we change tax policy and make it more attractive to do business in the United States.

We can talk about the various ways to do it. There is discussion about a territorial system, there is discussion about a worldwide taxation system for the multinational corporations. The bottom line—again, reflected in all of the reform proposals—is that competitive rates, which means lowering rates for small business and businesses of all sizes doing business in the United States, will help us create more jobs, and they will be red, white, and blue jobs. They will be jobs here in the United States.

So I assume this weekend—whether it is in coffee shops or on talk shows or wherever—people are going to be talking about this discussion about taxes, and they will say: Oh, I don't know if those folks in Washington are going to get anything done. And if they do anything, it will probably be a temporary thing, and they will all talk about why, if you had real tax reform, it might not do anything soon. And, well, it will take a lot more study, and that sort of thing.

I have been convincing this morning about why I believe permanent tax reform—permanent tax reform—will start changing the behavior of consumers in the marketplace, get them back into the marketplace, buying those products that fuel a consumer-driven economy. They will start doing it quickly if they see permanent tax reform enacted. I hope I have been able to clearly outline why a great deal of groundwork has been done already to allow us to move forward—not do the entire tax reform effort in the 6 or 8 weeks that the supercommittee has, but to get a foundation, a baseline in place, a baseline that is built around these areas of consensus, changes that are advocated, essentially, by all the reform proposals, and then allow the Senate Finance Committee, under the leadership of Chairman BAUCUS, and the House Ways and Means Committee, under the leadership of Chairman DAVE CAMP, to use the first few months of next year with their committees—the committees of jurisdiction; the Finance Committee here in the Senate, and the Ways and Means Committee in the other body—that they take the first 90 or 120 days to enact permanent tax reforms.

I think that will be a huge boost for the American economy. I think it will change the behavior of American consumers and American business because that is what markets do. They react when positive and permanent changes are put in place.

This can be thoroughly bipartisan. It was in 1986 when a whole host of quite progressive Democrats got together with Ronald Reagan. I have had the pleasure, over the last few years, to work with two outstanding Members on the other side of the aisle, former

Senator Gregg and Senator COATS, and Senator BEGICH of Alaska, a former small businessperson.

This is not like health care; we have done it before. The reform proposals are very much built around the same sort of principles which were the fundamentals of tax reform in 1986. While I know there is going to be considerable debate this weekend about whether tax reform can be done, whether it is going to change anybody's behavior or change anybody's behavior soon, I wanted to weigh in and outline why looking at the principles of the market, I believe, is going to change consumer behavior, change consumer and business behavior for the better, and that there has been a lot of groundwork laid that we can build on.

There is an opportunity, an opportunity for Democrats and Republicans in this Chamber to come together and take steps, steps that will end this anti-growth mess of a tax system, and give our consumers and businesses the certainty and predictability they need to grow, to come back into the American economy.

We will talk some more about this on the floor of this great body in the days ahead. I just want the American people to know this is an opportunity where, if there is a will to do permanent tax reform, there is a way to get it done.

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

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENDING THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 166, H.R. 2832.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

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

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 166, H.R. 2832, an act

to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Max Baucus, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Mark Udall, Debbie Stabenow, Jeff Bingaman, Daniel K. Inouye, Maria Cantwell, Patty Murray, Richard Blumenthal, Michael F. Bennet, Patrick J. Leahy, Tom Harkin, Barbara Boxer, Kent Conrad, Sherrod Brown, Carl Levin.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived and at 5:30 p.m., Monday, September 19, the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2832.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, first of all, I want everyone within the sound of my voice to understand that I do not like the Colombia Free Trade Agreement, the Korea Free Trade Agreement, or the Panama Free Trade Agreement. I will vote against them. But I have been asked on numerous occasions to move these trade matters to the floor.

That is what I have agreed to do, and I am going to do that. But it is very difficult for me to understand, when my Republican colleagues, the Chamber of Commerce, and others support these trade agreements, and they want them done, and now when I want to move to them, I cannot do it. It is hard to comprehend that we have to file cloture on a motion to proceed to an agreement we have. The agreement we have is that we are going to do trade adjustment assistance, and a few other stops in the middle, and then we are going to do the free trade agreements. Again, this is the pattern we have experienced for the last 8 months. It doesn't matter what it is.

This is something they agreed with. We are attempting to move to the free trade agreements and they are stopping us from doing that.

I hope the American people get the picture, and I am confident they are getting the picture more clearly every day. There isn't a thing we can bring up here that they don't stall to the very limit of the procedures here.

Again, we are going to move to the free trade agreements. The first part of the deal is trade adjustment assistance. We have to invoke cloture to do this. I think that is a travesty and it is too bad.

MORNING BUSINESS

BUDGETARY ADJUSTMENTS

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, last week, pursuant to section 106 of the Budget Control Act of 2011, I filed new committee allocations, new budgetary and Social Security aggregates, and a revised pay-as-you-go scorecard. Today, I am adjusting some of those levels, specifically the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2012 and the budgetary aggregates for fiscal years 2011 and 2012.

First, as specified under section 106(b)(1), I filed new allocations to the Committee on Appropriations. For 2012, that allocation was set consistent with the sum of the two limits on discretionary spending set forth in the Budget Control Act. Section 101 of the Budget Control Act establishes a limit of \$684 billion in new budget authority for the security category and \$359 billion in new budget authority for the nonsecurity category, for a total of \$1,043 billion. To match the divisions provided by the Budget Control Act, I am subdividing the initial allocation of \$1,043 billion in budget authority provided to the Committee on Appropriations into two separate amounts, \$684 billion for security funding and \$359 billion for nonsecurity funding.

Second, section 101 of the Budget Control Act allows for various adjustments to the statutory limits on discretionary spending, while section 106(d) allows the chairman of the Budget Committee to make revisions to allocations, aggregates, and levels consistent with those adjustments. The Committee on Appropriations reported three bills last week that are eligible for adjustments under the Budget Control Act. In total, I am making adjustments to the 2012 allocation to the Committee on Appropriations and the

budgetary aggregates of \$5.769 billion in budget authority and \$1.157 billion in outlays. Those adjustments reflect the sum of \$5.511 billion in budget authority and \$0.958 billion in outlays for funding designated for disaster relief, \$0 in budget authority and -\$0.007 billion in outlays for funding designated as an emergency, and \$0.258 billion in budget authority and \$0.206 billion in outlays for funding designated as being for overseas contingency operations.

Finally, I am making technical adjustments to the 2011 and 2012 budgetary aggregates. These adjustments are being made to remove amounts that the Senate allocates to the Appropriations Committee each year but does not count as part of the spending aggregates. A similar adjustment will be made at the time the Congress clears the relevant appropriations bills, such that the adjustments do not change the total amount of room that is available to the Senate under the aggregates in either year.

I ask unanimous consent that the following tables detailing the changes to the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations and the budgetary aggregates be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGETARY AGGREGATES.—PURSUANT TO SECTION 106(b)(1)(C) OF THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011 AND SECTION 311 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974

	[In millions of dollars]	
	2011	2012
Current Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,076,930	2,854,385
Outlays	3,167,997	2,987,419
Adjustments:		
Budget Authority	- 6,045	- 396
Outlays	- 6,023	- 4,998
Revised Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,070,885	2,853,989
Outlays	3,161,974	2,982,421

REVISIONS TO THE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 106 OF THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011 AND SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974

[In millions of dollars]

	Initial allocation/limit	Subdivide 2012 budget authority	Current allocation/limit	Adjustment	Revised allocation/limit
Fiscal Year 2011:					
General Purpose Discretionary Budget Authority	1,211,141	n/a	1,211,141	0	1,211,141
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays	1,391,055	n/a	1,391,055	0	1,391,055
Fiscal Year 2012:					
General Purpose Budget Authority	1,043,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Security Discretionary Budget Authority	n/a	684,000	684,000	4,458	688,458
Nonsecurity Discretionary Budget Authority	n/a	359,000	359,000	1,311	360,311
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays	1,262,000	n/a	1,262,000	1,157	1,263,157

DETAILS ON ADJUSTMENTS TO FISCAL YEAR 2012 ALLOCATIONS TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 106 OF THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011

[In billions of dollars]

	Disaster relief	Emergency	Overseas contingency operations	Total
Homeland Security:				
Budget Authority	4.200	0.000	0.258	4.458