

would mean we would be spending \$1.54 trillion, more than the \$1.50 trillion we spent last year. We would be spending more, not less.

The House has sent over a bill that would offset \$9 billion of that, which would bring the total spending this year to \$1.45 trillion. That would reduce our spending this year by \$5 billion, not as much as we promised in the Budget Act but at least a modest reduction.

It is a very important vote. It is a symbolic vote. It says: Are we honest with the American people when we go before them with a bill that says we are going to spend less than we spent last year, even if it was a small amount? We cannot even achieve that.

Perhaps that is why people are unhappy with us. We have been promising them that we would do something about the debt situation in this country. But we have not done much. As a matter of fact, we have done almost nothing.

So I would just urge my colleagues to think about that as they cast their votes on this portion of the House legislation, which has not been discussed much among our colleagues, and not particularly well-understood. But I do think it is important. I think it is an important, symbolic vote.

Are we willing to do that? It would amount to about a 1.86-percent, less than 2 percent across-the-board rescission to offset spending on the other spending items, exempting defense and some other items. Defense, of course, has taken dramatic cuts already. They are working on very dramatic cuts, and as a result of the failure of the committee of 12, they will take a huge cut.

The Defense Department has taken, on a percentage basis and a real dollar basis, far more in reductions than any other department. Of course this is not for war spending. War is in a separate overseas contingency account. This is the base defense budget that is taking the cuts. I wanted to share that with my colleagues.

I also appreciated Senator HOEVEN's presentation on the Keystone Pipeline. And I truly believe, and agree with my friend from Vermont, that unemployment is a tremendous problem for us.

What I don't agree with is that it can be fixed by borrowing and spending and taxing. That is what we have seen lately. I suggest that one way to deal with unemployment is to not spend any government money, get the government bureaucrats busy, examine this pipeline. We have pipelines crossing all over this country. If we bring those under control, approve this pipeline, it will add 20,000 real jobs and 100,000 indirect jobs and make this country more safe and secure from foreign energy exploitation.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for as long as I may consume.

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

The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the Omnibus appropriations conference report that I guess will be before this body at the pleasure of the members of the Appropriations Committee.

I call my colleagues' attention to the size of this bill. There are 13 agencies of government, all appropriations bills, and none of this, because of the pressing issues of the calendar, will be open to any amendments—no amendments regarding all these functions of government and a cost of, in this particular bill, it is \$915 billion. These are 9 appropriations bills of the 12. This contains \$915 billion that we will probably be considering, and because of the fact that we all have to get out of town—and I am one of those—we will vote sometime tomorrow, and we will be able to tell our constituents we have completed our task for the year, at least as far as funding the government to continue—as we seem to threaten to do every year, although I am not sure people are as frightened as they used to be.

This bill before me is 1,221 pages long and contains funding for nine of the annual appropriations bills, for a grand total of \$915 billion. If you add the three appropriations bills already enacted, we are going to spend \$1.043 trillion. That is a fantastic improvement because last year it was \$1.1 trillion. So I am glad our constituents, whom we promised, when some of us, such as myself, ran in 2010 for reelection, that we would get this \$15 trillion debt under control—and we go back to Washington and eliminate the reckless and out-of-control spending, I am sure they will be pleased to know that instead of \$1.1 trillion, we are now down to \$1.043 trillion—a reduction of approximately 5 percent. We can get a better deal than that at the Macy's Christmas sale. Of course, not to forget the earmarks—here it is.

I am confident no average Member of the Senate—what I mean by that is not a member of the Appropriations Committee has had a chance to peruse this hernia-inducing piece of legislation. If it sounds like I am a little cynical and a little angry, it is because I am, and the American people are cynical and angry.

There are 535 Members of Congress. All of us are sent by our constituents to represent them. But I think the American people and our constituents should know this is a report on a bill that is signed by 37 Members of the House and 17 Members of the Senate. There are 535 Members, and these are the ones who put this together. It is full of hundreds of earmarks, pork, unnecessary spending, and projects in the defense portion of the bill, which I will be talking a fair amount about, which

are neither requested nor needed by the men and women serving in the military. It is full of things I will talk about later on, such as artifact museums for Guam, medical research—this is in the Defense appropriations bill and has nothing to do with defense.

Then we begin to wonder why the American people have such a low opinion of our performance in our Nation's Capital. I saw a poll that says it is as low as 9 percent. Hopefully, that is not representative—maybe it is a 10-, 11-, 12-percent approval rating. We were debating a bill last year that had \$1.1 trillion and contained 6,488 earmarks that totaled \$8.3 billion. Now we have a bill that is \$915 billion, and this year we have no traditional earmarks, but there is \$3.5 billion in unauthorized spending in the Department of Defense portion of the bill alone—the Defense appropriations part of it is \$3.5 billion, on which there has never been a hearing, and it has never been considered by the Armed Services Committee. If it was, it was rejected. So we have \$3.5 billion just in the defense part of the bill. Nobody wanted it or asked for it, neither the military, nor the services, nor was there a hearing. They added \$3.5 billion in the Department of Defense alone.

I think the men and women in the military deserve better than some of these earmarks that I will talk about. Here we are, we are going to rush and beat the clock, and we haven't even moved to this piece of legislation yet. In case some of our constituents don't know, a call will be made to everybody saying please agree to a few hours' time agreement so we can vote tomorrow and we can all go home, and we will. There will not be a single amendment debated and voted on, on this bill on this floor. I would like to say we didn't see it coming, but the fact is we did see it coming.

In keeping with the regular order and legislating requirements of the Senate, the Armed Services Committee—of which I have been a proud member for many years—scheduled and conducted more than 70 hearings, vetted the President's budget request, and reported a bill out. Seven months later, we moved to the floor of the Senate and we did authorize funding and hundreds of millions of dollars and the appropriators decided they knew better. We have a fundamental problem in the Senate, and we are unable to engage in the process of authorizing prior to the regular appropriations. What is the outcome? A handful of people—all good, honest, decent people, I am sure—and unelected staff disburse hundreds of billions of dollars, often in a manner that directly contradicts the will of the authorizers—those who are entrusted in their Committee assignments to authorize what is necessary to defend this Nation.

So here we are at the eleventh hour ramming through a measure so we can get out of town for the holidays. I will talk about some of the provisions,

most of which are in the Defense appropriations portion of this conference report.

Section 8083 of the bill permits the Secretary of Defense to transfer operations and maintenance funds. Operations and maintenance funds are supposed to buy the gas and the spare parts—the things that keep the military machine moving. That is what it is. So \$33 million goes to Guam, and this funding is in direct contradiction of the explicit direction that was in the conference report that prevented this because we knew it was coming.

If this omnibus bill were subject to amendment, I would immediately seek to strip the funding from this bill. Let me be clear. This funding I am talking about for Guam is a “bridge to nowhere.” The money, in part, is to provide the Government of Guam funds to buy 53 civilian schoolbuses. They put money in the Defense bill for 53 schoolbuses and 53 repair kits for the buses for \$10.7 million. That is to buy schoolbuses and repair kits for Guam. Why? Why would we want to do that? Their reasoning is because we are redeploying marines from Japan. But we have paused that redeployment in the authorization bill because we don’t know exactly how to do it. So we are pausing the redeployment of marines; meanwhile, the appropriators move forward and put \$10.7 million in to buy civilian schoolbuses, and not one single marine, sailor or airman has been assigned to Guam as part of the intended buildup that would justify in any way using that money.

What else are we buying with this \$33 million? Well, \$12.7 million is intended to be used for a cultural artifacts repository. I am not making that up—\$12.7 million of your tax dollars is buying a cultural artifacts repository in Guam, in the name of the redeployment of the U.S. marines from Japan, which is not taking place. They claim it is related to artifacts that will be dug up during the major military construction projects that have been planned for Guam as part of the buildup. But with the agreement of the Pentagon, we have put it on hold.

I guess it is important when you are doing a military construction project to preserve the artifacts. The money intended for this cultural artifacts repository is, at best, early, and much less if it were ever needed. So here we are with an investment of at least \$33 million on a “bridge to nowhere” to hold artifacts that will never be dug out of the Earth.

The money in this Defense appropriations bill for this cultural artifacts repository is actually going to be spent to build a 20,000-square-foot museum, most of which will be used for the storage of existing artifacts and existing administration, completely unrelated to the major military construction projects associated with the buildup on Guam.

They get the benefits of \$12.5 million in Federal largess for a new museum,

which otherwise they could not get. I would like to say there are many citizens of Arizona who are out of work, whose homes have been lost, and who would benefit from any sort of action by the Federal Government—the holiday season is approaching in my State and all over America where there is not enough money to fund the food banks, and we are going to spend money on schoolbuses and cultural repositories in Guam.

That is not the end of the story. This initial funding grant to Guam of \$33 million includes \$9.6 million for the first phase of a mental health facility. They claim that is somehow related to the proposed military buildup on Guam. I am still trying to sort that one out. Without one additional marine or his family being stationed on Guam, how does a proposed buildup not happening for years help with a mental health facility on Guam?

It might not surprise you to learn this money for a new mental health facility has nothing to do with any marines coming to Guam but is required to satisfy a current Federal injunction that mandates the construction of a new facility. So take it out of Defense. Take it out of the hardware and the operations and maintenance our men and women in the military need.

Our committee did the research for these projects. We reviewed the working papers of the Department of Defense’s Economic Adjustment Committee and found this funding would not go to its priorities and decided, as a conference, not to support the authorization.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Working Papers Excerpt of DOD’s Economic Adjustment Committee.

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

ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT COMMITTEE 2010 GUAM SOCIOECONOMIC NEEDS ASSESSMENT WORKING PAPERS

SUMMARY OF PROJECTS ASSESSED

PUBLIC HEALTH AND HEALTH CARE—GUAM MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE FACILITY

Recommendation: Consider for Fiscal Year 2012 budget submission. A Federal injunction mandates Guam Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse to hire additional staff and construct a new facility to provide for approximately 60 percent of identified and un-served cases. Projected military buildup induced growth could adversely impact the island’s mental health and substance abuse system. A new \$34.2 million facility provides enhanced treatment services in counseling, physical training, recreation, daily living assistance, peer support, and speech therapy.

CULTURAL—CULTURAL REPOSITORY

Recommendation: Consider for Fiscal Year 2012 budget submission. Federal law requires the U.S. Government to curate and archive cultural artifacts discovered as a result of U.S. Government construction. Guam’s existing space to receive, study, and store such unearthed cultural artifacts is inadequate. A \$12.7 million Cultural Repository will provide 20,000 square feet of curatorial and administrative spaces. Currently, the majority

of Guam’s artifacts reside in foreign museums for archival storage.

EDUCATION—BUS FLEET

Recommendation: Consider for Fiscal Year 2012 budget submission. This \$10.7 million project buys 53 school buses and associated spare parts’ packages to correct Guam’s severe shortage of school buses. Future induced population growth will further strain the busing system.

EXCERPTS

PROJECT 1: GUAM MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE FACILITY

GovGuam provided an initial \$34.2 million cost estimate to build a new mental health and substance abuse facility at Oka Point. When completed, this facility would provide enhanced treatment services that include counseling, physical training, recreation, assistance with activities of daily living, peer support, and speech therapy, in addition to other efficiencies gained through close location to other related inpatient and outpatient medical care. Presently, the GovGuam Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse (DMHSA) program is managed by the court-appointed Guam Federal Management Team (FMT) and the Guam Mental Health Planning Council. DMHSA is currently under permanent Federal injunction and is required to hire additional staff and construct a new facility to address their deficiencies. Due to inadequate staff and facility resources, DMHSA is not able to provide services to approximately 60 percent of 1,400 identified as requesting assistance.

PROJECT 2: CULTURAL REPOSITORY

The Federal Team reviewed a \$12.7 million project cost estimate from GovGuam for the design, construction and outfitting of a Cultural Repository that would provide 15,000 square feet to store existing artifacts, artifacts anticipated to be discovered during the buildup of military forces on the island, and an additional 5,000 square feet of space for administrative offices. Presently, GovGuam provides artifacts to foreign museums for exhibitions or stores them in 7,600 square feet of space split between two floors of an office building. This storage space is presently over capacity and does not meet cultural storage requirements, including environmental controls. The proposed facility would be located on government owned land and be adjacent to the future Guam Institute of Natural History and Cultural Heritage (GINHCH). The present facility would be decommissioned and the artifacts would be transferred to this new facility with the remainder of the space projected to be occupied in 10 years.

PROJECT 3: SCHOOL BUS FLEET

GovGuam estimates \$10.7 million is needed to purchase 53 school buses and spare parts packages. The school bus fleet provides transportation services to all non-DoD students on the island for both public and private schools and for extracurricular activities. The bus fleet is also an integral part of the island’s emergency response plan and is used for population relocation during large scale events. Currently, the fleet operates only at 47 percent, requiring buses to be triple cycled during the day. Schools also start classes at different times in order to ensure that all children can be bused to school. Daily bus runs begin before 6:00 a.m., resulting in some students arriving well before classes begin. Subsequent morning bus cycles often deliver students to school well after classes have begun. At the end of the school day, students are often delayed by hours in their departure from school due to school bus shortages.

Mr. McCain. Mr. President, this is not the way Congress is supposed to

work. Authorizing committees exist to provide specific congressional approval of Federal spending. Appropriations committees and subcommittees exist to take the available Federal dollars and allocate them to programs consistent with the authorizations that have been provided by the authorizing committees. In no way do appropriations committees have the legitimate authority to override the specific direction of authorizing committees when those authorizing committees have spoken to a matter and denied authority for a specific type or level of funding.

This is why the approval rating of Congress is in single digits. The American people have seen through this. They see this kind of abuse and waste and they have had enough of it. If you don't understand the rise of the tea party, you can start by looking right here.

It is not as if this issue was somehow hidden from the leadership of the Appropriations Committee. I wrote to the chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. Let me give a few examples of what the Appropriations Committee has done.

There is a program called MEADS—the Medium Extended Air Defense System. The program was supposed to have been terminated as originally proposed in the Senate version of the bill. The Defense appropriations portion of the bill is at \$390 million, nearly the entire \$406 million requested. We found out the Appropriations Committee was going to fund the program, and I felt compelled to ensure the final Defense authorization conference report prohibits any funding beyond 2012. Under the requirements imposed by the Defense authorization conference report, this year's funding will be restrained by prohibiting the Department from spending more than 25 percent until the Secretary of Defense provides a plan to either restructure the program in a way that requires no additional funding or terminates the program. So we wanted to get this report from the Secretary. But what did the Appropriations Committee do? The full \$406 million.

I think my colleagues should understand, they have decided to never put this system—the Medium Extended Air Defense System—into operation. They want to have a corporate memory, a memory of what they have learned in spending what ends up to be a couple of billion dollars.

The Next-Generation Bomber. The President asked there not be money proposed for the Next-Generation Bomber, but the appropriators chose to add \$100 million—\$100 million. This is money for the Next Generation Bomber that was not requested by the Air Force nor was there any testimony by the Air Force leadership, either civilian or military, in support of this additional huge addition in funding. It magically appeared here.

This morning, I tried to find out if this money would be wisely spent, and

the answer is no. We called the Air Force Chief of Staff. They said they didn't request the funding. They do not want it. The money is ahead of need, meaning it could not be applied to the program in an effective or efficient manner.

The analysis of alternatives, which helps determine what the capability of the bomber should be, will not be completed for another year and a half. The capabilities requirement document, which is key to ensuring the new bomber design is stable—which is needed to determine if increased taxpayer dollars should be invested in the new bomber—is not complete and will not be complete for a couple of years. Finally, they wanted to use this money to sustain the bomber force they have.

So why? Why? Why would we add \$100 million when there is absolutely no way it could be used? Well, I can only say there are reasons for it. I will not make allegations, but it is not magic. It is not something that appears out of thin air.

There is a program called Combat Dragon. Of approximately 100 unrequested and unauthorized additions above the President's budget request found in the appropriations bill, one of the more interesting ones is a \$20 million allocation for an obscure aircraft program called Combat Dragon II. The name is interesting. Sounds pretty exciting. You won't find it in the President's budget request. It didn't appear in our authorization bill. So I asked my staff to find out what happened.

The purpose of the program: Combat Dragon II is to lease up to four crop-duster-type aircraft and to outfit them with machine gun pods, laser-guided bombs, rockets, and air-to-air missiles. I asked if this request was justified, vetted, approved in any way. The answer was no, no, no. There is no urgent operational requirement for this type of aircraft.

After a little investigation, we found this aircraft lease will not be—surprise, surprise—competitively awarded. As such, it is effectively earmarked for a particular aircraft manufacturer that has the corner on this particularly obscure part of the aviation market.

The C-17. The Defense appropriations bill adds \$225 million—only \$225 million—for an unrequested, unauthorized C-17 aircraft that no one in the U.S. Air Force or the Pentagon thought we needed. According to every strategic planning document, the Air Force has an excess capacity of large cargo aircraft, and the Air Force already has 222 C-17 cargo aircraft and more than 80 C-55s.

The key reason for an overage of large cargo aircraft is because the Appropriations Committee over the past several years added 44 C-17s that were not authorized—that we neither needed nor could afford—at a cost of \$14 billion above the Department's request.

The OMB, five Secretaries of Defense, the Commander of Transportation

Command, and the current Secretary of the Air Force have all unanimously stated they do not need nor can they afford to operate any more C-17 aircraft. In fact, the President appealed to the Congress and said the Nation cannot afford any more. You would think after \$14 billion and 44 C-17s, averaging over \$250 million each, that would be enough of an earmark. Obviously, not so for the Appropriations Committee.

There are others in here. Some of my old favorites. There is \$25 million for unrequested helicopter upgrades, an increase to the Civil Air Patrol Program of \$7 million, unrequested, unauthorized; \$273 million in unrequested, unauthorized research on everything from Parkinson's disease and HIV to alternative energy and nanotechnology.

Speaking of alternate energy, the appropriators tucked unrequested, unauthorized funding throughout a certain division of the bill, and \$130 million in ambiguously named "alternative energy research" is scattered for the same sort of programs that brought us the recent achievement of the Department of the Navy, which proudly announced the purchase of 450,000 gallons of alternative fuels for \$12 million. My friends, that equates to \$26 a gallon. I am certain our constituents will be glad to know their tax dollars are now going toward paying \$26 a gallon for aviation fuel.

But, no, no, they need more money—\$262 million in unauthorized Navy research and development programs. The list of Navy adds is eerily similar to the Army's, and as you would expect, it covers a familiar set of Member interest items—nanotechnology, alternative energy, and giveaways to home-State interests.

There are increases for Space Situational Awareness.

I repeat, \$50 million in increases for Space Situational Awareness in two funding lines—just two lines—with no justification. No argument for it. Maybe it is good. It may be good, but we won't know. We won't know for months and months and months, and maybe years.

For those who are interested in the compelling national security issue of space situational awareness, you will be glad to know \$50 million of your tax dollars is going to be spent there.

The budget requested \$86 million for Operationally Responsive Space. This bill adds \$26 million more, just for fun.

The Armed Services Committee authorized, and the Congress will soon appropriate, some \$290 million for research into post-traumatic stress disorder, prosthetics, blast injury, and psychological health. These are critical to improving our actual battlefield medicine. Yet once again, the appropriators inserted unrequested money for medical research, this time to the tune of \$600 million.

Let me remind my colleagues that these unrequested projects are funded at the expense of other military priorities. I agree that research on multiple

sclerosis is necessary, and Alzheimer's and cancer. But why should it have to come out of the Defense funding?

I will tell you why it does. It is the same reason why Willie Sutton robbed banks. When they asked him why, he said, that is because the money is there. So this money, which may be meritorious to spend on Alzheimer's and cancer and other medical issues, should not come out of the Defense appropriations bill.

Of course, the Guard and Reserve always come in and get additional money. They got \$1 billion in unrequested, unauthorized funding for "miscellaneous equipment." I repeat: \$1 billion for "miscellaneous equipment." I am sure certain States on the appropriators' short list will be very pleased to have the money directed their way. I am not so sure about the taxpayers.

Some have merit, some don't. None of the ones I talked about were requested. And this is just in Defense. The tragedy of all this is, except for the Senator from Oklahoma and myself and a few others, all this will slide through and the American people—obviously, the taxpayers—will pick up the tab.

We won't have a chance to address the issue of the bonuses that have gone to the executives of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac that have cost the American citizens so many hundreds of billions of dollars. We are going to let these people—because this won't be appropriated—we are going to let them take home annual salaries of \$900,000 and bonuses of \$12.08 million, while they ask the taxpayers for more bail-out money. Mr. Edward DeMarco says that is the only way you can get good people to serve the country.

I am sure the men and women in the military would be interested to know that is what is required to serve. The base pay of a four-star general is \$179,000. The Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court makes \$223,000. But Mr. DeMarco feels people who are working at Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac deserve \$900,000, and millions of dollars in bonuses.

After all, they are doing such a great job.

The Alaska Native corporations is one of my favorites. We need to be especially mindful of how taxpayer dollars are appropriated. The Army Corps, in light of a recent Justice Department investigation, revealed what prosecutors called one of the largest bribery scandals in U.S. history involving Army Corps contracting officials and the contracting director of Eyak Technology, an ANC-owned company. In the authorization bill, we are trying to have all of these small business funding issues, no matter whether it be in an ANC or others, looked at.

And, of course, we won't be able to address the Solyndra issue. Private investors will collect the first \$69 million that can be recovered from the company, with taxpayers placed in second position by the Department of Energy.

If we had been able to amend this bill, I would have worked with my colleague, Dr. COBURN, to restore much needed funding to the Government Accountability Office. In a recent report released by Dr. COBURN, he highlights that "just this year GAO identified hundreds of billions of dollars of duplicative and overlapping programs that, if addressed by Congress, could both save money and improve services for taxpayers. For every \$1 spent on the GAO, the agency provides \$90 in savings recommendations. Yet, instead of adopting those good-government reforms, the Senate Appropriations Committee has responded by proposing dramatic budget cuts to the GAO."

I don't want to go through all this pork that I just described again, but we can afford all that and yet we are going to cut the only watchdog organization that really gives us an objective view of what we do here in Congress. I am sure that it is a coincidence.

So here we are again. Here we are again, the same thing as last year, the same thing for years—a few Members of the House and Senate making decisions on hundreds of billions of dollars, perhaps over \$1 trillion, and we, the other Members, because of our desire—understandable—to leave this body and return to our homes for the holidays, after a few hours of debate, no amendments, no changes in the bill, not having had the ability to even examine it, we will be voting.

I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. I would just mention, I say to my colleague from Oklahoma, the issue of this cutting of the budget of the Government Accountability Office. It seems rather strange to me. And I would be curious, with this cut to the Government Accountability Office, what will the effect be on our ability to have this watchdog organization give us the reports and information we need as far as the functions of government are concerned?

Mr. COBURN. I thank the Senator for his question.

I think the people need to know what the GAO actually does. The GAO is nonpartisan; they are not Democrats or Republicans. They are accountants, and they are investigators, and they are the most valuable tool we have because we won't do the oversight of calling agencies up here. I think the numbers are that we are going to lose 400 investigators and auditors out of the GAO. One question to ask is, Why is it we are cutting the GAO more than we are cutting our own budget?

Let me make one additional point. Things are not right in our country because things aren't right in the Senate. This 1,200-page bill that should have come out here appropriations bill by appropriations bill—11 or 12 appropriations bills—has over \$3.5 billion worth

of phonemarks in it. We don't have earmarks anymore; they are all phonemarks. The corruption is still here. The pay-to-play game is still going on in Washington. Now we just don't do it in the bill, we do it by telephone, and we threaten agencies: If you don't give this money to this person, your money will be cut the next year.

So the fact is, although we have an earmark ban, there are thousands of earmarks in this bill. And what do we do? We cut the very agency that is going to be required to help us solve our financial problems over the next few years; we cut them more than we cut our own budgets. Now, they can be cut, and appropriately so. Everybody is going to have to share. But to cut the GAO 6.4 percent—40 percent more than we are cutting our own budgets—out of spite? They and the Congressional Research Service do the best work on the Hill. They do better than we do. Yet we are going to take away a tool that is going to help this country solve its very difficult financial problems. I think it is outrageous. It nauseates me.

Mr. MCCAIN. I would ask my colleague, I identified \$3.5 billion unrequested, unauthorized, no-hearing-on projects—\$3.5 billion. Since Dr. COBURN has taken a broader view of things, I wonder how many billions he would estimate totally there are of these unauthorized, unrequested projects in the entire bill.

Mr. COBURN. I would just respond to the Senator, I don't know for sure because we haven't been able to go through the whole bill, and the creativity associated with parochialism and getting reelected by helping the very well-connected few in this country is unbelievable. So it is hidden, and it takes a long time. It doesn't take 48 hours.

We got this bill at 2:00 Tuesday morning. That is when we got it. And of course nobody is around at 2:00 Tuesday morning, are they? So we will have 72 hours to read a 1,200-page book, and then we have to figure out what is in it. As the Senator said, we are not going to know what is in it, not until the next Solyndra comes, not until the next person goes to jail, not until the next Senator goes to jail. We are not going to know.

The fact is, what we are seeing is irresponsible behavior on the part of the Congress with this bill, and if we don't break this cycle of protecting incumbency through spending money, we are not going to have a country left. It is not just wrong, it is immoral. It is immoral.

The Senator talked about research at the Department of Defense. There are good reasons to do medical research at the Department of Defense, but we have the world's premier institutes, the National Institutes of Health. Now, we are not increasing them significantly, but we are markedly increasing the study of MS at a military research facility instead of through NIH, where we are spending \$100 million already a

year on it? So we are going to duplicate it.

I have said it before: We have taken a stupid pill. We have either taken a stupid pill or a corruption pill. I don't know which it is. But I know that the long-term effects of doing this kind of legislating at this time in our history, when we have the greatest difficulty and the greatest landmines ahead of us financially—for us to do what we are doing here today to please a very small group of Congressmen and Senators who happen to make up the Appropriation Committee and to address their election concerns and their knowing better than the authorization committees—it won't surprise the Senator that in this bill, this conglomeration of what I will call an omni-terrible, is over \$400 billion in spending that is unauthorized, that has never been authorized or the authorizations have expired long ago and the authorizing committees don't reauthorize it for a reason, and yet we keep spending the money.

So I think it is amazing that we have as high as a 9-percent approval rating. And I am saddened not just for us, I am saddened for the future of America that we would now, right before Christmas—because we are running on a deadline to go home we are going to pass a bill that is essentially irresponsible, inept, and loaded with political favors instead of doing the best right thing for this country.

The GAO, in late February, early March, put out a report on duplication in the Federal Government. Most of my colleagues applauded it. It was a great deal of work that they spent a lot of time on. The second and third component of that, of the Federal Government, is coming out this February, and in it were hundreds of billions of dollars of duplicative programs. Not in one place in this bill that we have been able to find so far has any of what the GAO said should be eliminated, should be discontinued—none of it has happened.

What is the consequence of spending \$200 billion of borrowed money—money we don't have—on things the GAO says we don't need? What is the consequence of that? The consequence of that is impoverishment of our children. It is the theft of opportunity from our children. That is what it is. So I don't say the word "corruption" lightly. When you are stealing opportunity and you are impoverishing those who follow, that is corrupt. It is also immoral.

We won't be able to defeat this bill. We won't be able to amend this bill. We won't be able to offer amendments to what the GAO said is absolute stupidity because of the way we are bringing this up and the fact that we didn't bring these bills through here. And the bills they did bring through, they limited the amendments on anyway. So the voice of the average American doesn't get heard in the Senate under the way it is operating right now. Good ideas that actually will improve our country and save us money don't ever

get heard. That is not the America I know. That is not the country I love.

So we are leading by example into our demise, and this is one of the greatest examples of that I have seen.

Mr. MCCAIN. May I also point out, as my colleague did, that all of us as Members of the Senate are guided to some degree by seniority, which means assignment and ranking in various committees. But we should have an equal opportunity to represent our constituents and our priorities and our views and our goals.

This document was signed by 37 Members of the House and 17 Members of the Senate, so really this system hands the important decisions that all 535 Members of the House and Senate are responsible for over to 37 in the House and 17 in the Senate. Neither the Senator from Oklahoma nor I had a single time to discuss with our colleagues all that is in this bill. Not a single time did we have a chance to say: Wait a minute, let's not put in that cultural repository for Guam. Not a single time did we have a chance to say: Hey, this Combat Dragon II is not really something we need to fund. You know, the Civil Air Patrol is really a great outfit, but we don't think we need to add \$7 million in these difficult times. We think helicopters needed to be upgraded, but why should we add \$25 million to helicopter upgrades when the military says we don't need \$25 million for helicopter upgrades? This is what is wrong with this system.

Mr. COBURN. If I could respond, that \$25 million is going to go to one company—we don't know where yet—that is well-connected and well-heeled to either a Member of the House or the Senate. Mark my words, that is where it is going. Somebody—one individual business, one individual constituent—is going to benefit from that at the expense of our children and our future.

Mr. MCCAIN. So the system now has deteriorated to the point where these decisions are made—by the way, I would like to correct the record. There are 37 total Members in the House and Senate, so 37 out of 535 who would be making these decisions.

So we really are in a kind of situation where we come down and all we can do is complain about it. That seems to me a deprivation of all of us who are not in that group of 37 of the ability to make our input into the future of this country. I do not think the American people are going to stand for it too much longer. I really don't.

I say to my colleague, I think a couple of things are going to happen. I think in the next election—I say this to all my colleagues. I think in the next election no incumbent is safe. But I also say, one way or another there is going to be a third party in the political arena of the United States. We cannot keep doing these things, Republican and Democrat, without sooner or later a response by the very well-informed electorate—thanks to devices like this.

I believe we have done this long enough. For long enough the American people, who now are in more dire economic straits than they have been since the Great Depression, are fed up with spending a few million dollars on schoolbuses in Guam that have nothing to do with our Nation's defense.

I hope the Senator from Oklahoma will not give up. I certainly will not. But I think, frankly, the American people deserve a lot better than they are getting out of this process. If they are cynical and if they are angry and if they are frustrated, they have every reason to be so.

I yield the floor.

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

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

ENERGY POLICY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I guess I am one of several Senators who doesn't know for sure what is going to happen tonight or tomorrow. I do know that we have one very contentious issue in the pipeline. Several people have been talking about this. I would like to give, perhaps, a different, maybe a historic perspective on this issue as we are looking at it.

I think with all the talk and all the demagoging people want us to be independent from the Middle East when producing our energy in fact we have the recoverable resources in the United States to be totally independent—for the North American Continent to be totally independent in providing its own energy. We are the only country in the world that does not exploit its own resources. We have more recoverable reserves in oil, gas, and coal than any other country in the world. Yet it is a political problem because there are people who do not want to exploit our own resources. They do not want to go offshore. They do not want to go there.

Eighty-four percent of our onshore public land is off-limits, so we cannot drill there. It is very disturbing when we see the real reason. We have an administration that doesn't want us to exploit our own resources. We have a Secretary of Energy who said we are going to have to get the price of gasoline in the pumps comparable to Europe, \$8 a gallon, before people realize we have to go in another direction other than fossil fuels. We have an Assistant Secretary of Energy who said we have to wean ourselves off fossil fuels.

All this green energy stuff is fine, and someday when the technology is there we will be able to do something with it. But it is not there. In the meantime, we have to run this machine called America.