

brothers are trying to buy a new government: "It's because we can make more profit, OK?"

That is what this is all about for Charles and David Koch: bigger profits, more money because \$100 billion or more isn't enough for them.

By their own admission, the Kochs will spend and spend and spend until they get the government they want—a government that lets Koch Industries do what it wants, a government whose sole goal is to make these billionaires even richer.

Unfortunately for the United States, the Supreme Court has constructed a political system that allows them to do just that. The Citizens United case, decided in January 2010, has effectively put the U.S. Government up for sale to the highest bidder, and right now the Koch brothers are the highest bidder. Right now our country has no real restrictions on how much money a billionaire or a millionaire can spend to buy the government they want. All the power is with the wealthy, and that puts middle-class Americans at a significant disadvantage.

So we can't stand idly by while the government sits on an auction block and neither should any American sit idly by. Instead, we should be working to rid the system of the Koch brothers' dark money, but this cannot and will not happen if reporters and journalists refuse to ask Charles and David Koch questions—maybe even probing questions. Otherwise no one is holding these two oil barons accountable for their nefarious actions.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S.J. Res. 22, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 22) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the definition of "waters of the United States" under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12 noon will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HELLER. I will yield.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Nevada I be recognized, unless an intervening minority Member should come in, in which case that I be recognized after that minority Member.

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

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I rise to speak on an issue that will impact every single one of my constituents and probably all of the constituents of my colleagues in this body; namely, the Environmental Protection Agency's and the Army Corps of Engineers' new definition for "navigable waters."

Also known as waters of the United States, this overreaching and burdensome regulation is bad for Nevada and frankly it is bad for the Nation. My home State of Nevada is one of the driest in the Nation, and the water of course is a very precious resource. The only thing more scarce than water in the Silver State is probably private property, and the implementation of this waters of the United States rule will only do more harm for both of these.

Since coming to Congress, one of my primary goals has been to promote job-creating policies that grow Nevada's economy, and the key to promoting these types of policies is to cut redtape regulations handed down by Washington bureaucrats. Unfortunately, time and time again, this administration is bound and determined to issue overly burdensome regulations that damage the economy and stifle job creation. The latest edict from Washington bureaucrats is no different.

After years of failed legislative attempts to change the scope of regulatory authority over water, this administration has overturned both congressional intent and multiple Supreme Court decisions to further overregulate hard-working Nevadans. I have long been an outspoken advocate and a cosponsor of Senator BARRASSO's legislation, the Federal Water Quality Protection Act, that would make the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers redo this rule and consider stakeholder input—something they completely ignored the last time around. Considering that nearly 87 percent of my home State is managed by the Federal Government—which I often refer to as our Federal landlords—it is easy to see why this rule is thought of by many back home as yet another Federal land grab.

I have heard from many of my constituents who have shared with me their staunch opposition to this rule, like Marlow from Ruby Valley and Darryl from Yerington. They write about the rule that it "creates confusion and risk by providing the Agencies with almost unlimited authority to regulate, at their discretion, any low spot where rainwater collects, including farm ditches, ephemeral drainages, agricultural ponds and isolated wet-

lands found in and near farms and ranching."

The EPA may tell us that farmers and ranchers are protected from this regulation by exemptions under the Clean Water Act. The problem with this so-called exemption is that if a landowner made any changes on their farmland or their ranch since 1977 that impacts any land or any water on their property, they do not qualify for an exemption. Think about it again. Since 1977, if a landowner made any changes on their ranch land or on their farm that impacts water or land, they don't qualify for this exemption. So under this new rule, almost everyone would be regulated.

Ranching is the backbone of Nevada's rural economy. Implementation of this rule will devastate Nevada's landowners and businesses. Like Marlow and Darryl, I believe this rule needs to be redone with significant input from local stakeholders and in a way that will not impact the ability of Nevada ranchers to provide food for Americans.

Unfortunately, the Senate was not even able to proceed to this measure and debate legislation to exert some much needed oversight over the EPA due to the left's circle-the-wagon mentality of the Obama agenda. Although I was sad to see this vote fail, today I am proud to stand in support of Senator ERNST's resolution of disapproval, which will send this regulation back to the administration and send a clear message that Congress doesn't accept overreaching regulations created by Washington bureaucrats.

The fact is, the implementation of this rule has already been halted by the Federal courts. I strongly believe that at the end of the day, the courts will decide to overturn this onerous regulation. That is why I stand here today to urge my colleagues to support this resolution of disapproval. Instead of waiting years for the courts to decide, Congress needs to take immediate action to show this administration that we will not stand for any more regulations that kill jobs and stifle economic growth.

Good stewardship of our natural resources is part of Nevada's character that makes it so unique. This is not about dirty water or a rollback of the Clean Water Act. This is about Federal regulations that severely limit land use, infringe on property rights, and diminish economic activity in Nevada and nationwide. This is about Federal regulatory overreach by an agency that is using the Clean Water Act as a means to greatly increase its authority. At a time when the American public is still waiting for answers on the Animas River spill in Colorado, I find it greatly disturbing that this Agency is using clean drinking water as an excuse to gain authority over all waters of the United States. Enough is enough with these power trips.

Should we really trust the "Environmental Protection Agency" with this?

As a sportsman, I grew up understanding the importance of being a