

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Republican leader modify his request?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Reserving the right to object, we didn't get amendments on Shaheen-Portman. So what the majority leader is now saying is he wants to pass a kind of comprehensive energy bill dealing with a variety of different subjects without any amendments at all as a condition for having a vote on Keystone with five amendments related to the subject.

I can remember when we used to vote around here. In fact, his Members have only had seven rollcall votes in a year. He has one Member from Alaska who has never had a rollcall vote on the floor his entire Senate career.

So I think rather than these UCs going back and forth, maybe we ought to talk about how to work this out and see if maybe the Senate could actually start voting on things again. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. REID. Yes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, let's not have revisionist history. Let's have real, valid history.

Shaheen-Portman was worked on for weeks last fall. SHAHEEN and PORTMAN worked on this new version of the bill for months, and they worked out many amendments in the committee. They came to me and said they have all this worked out—SHAHEEN and PORTMAN and a number of other Senators. I said: Great.

So before one of our recesses, the day we were getting ready to leave, they came to me and said: What we need to know and what would be even better is if we had a sense-of-the-Senate resolution on Keystone.

I said: We already agreed to what we are going to do. The bill is different with all of this input, such as the Workforce Investment Act, which we will take up this afternoon. So I came back and said: OK, we will have a sense-of-the-Senate; that is fine. And we are going to do this as soon as we get back.

We came back and then I was told: Well, we don't want a sense-of-the-Senate resolution; we want an up-or-down vote here.

I said: OK, let's do it. And that is when that still wasn't good enough. That still wasn't good enough because they want the issue.

The energy efficiency bill is a good bipartisan bill. It is like the one we are going to work on this afternoon. It is a complex bill, but the differences have been worked out, and we should go ahead and vote on it.

So if they really care about Keystone—if this is such a big deal—the Republican leader said we have been working on this for 5 years. The time has come. Let's belly up to the bar where we vote, and let's vote on it. But

in the process, let's also do the bipartisan energy efficiency legislation that JEANNE SHAHEEN has put her heart into.

So that is where we are: another obstruction, diversion to keep us from really voting on things. They want the issue. They are focused on procedure. And what the American people want is for us to do things. They want the minimum wage raised. They want unemployment benefits extended for the long-term unemployed. They would like it so that a man working doesn't make more money than a woman who does the same work. The American people believe they should not be burdened with college debt which is larger than any other debt. It is \$1.3 trillion now. They have stopped us from doing that based on procedure. Why don't we work on things that will help the American people?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the exchange between the majority leader and myself come out of our leader time in order not to take further time of the Members.

Mr. REID. I agree to that. That is fine.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota.

EPA OVERREGULATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, as I mentioned previously, my colleagues and I intend to enter into a colloquy on the floor of the Senate to talk about an issue that is important to many of our States. The Senator from Wyoming, the Senator from North Dakota, and the Senator from Kansas are all very much impacted, as are our constituents, by the EPA's pursuing and being particularly active in issuing misguided and ill-conceived proposals that will do little more than overregulate and burden hard-working Americans, businesses, and families. One of the worst of these overreaches is the Obama EPA's proposal to significantly expand its authority to regulate small wetlands, creeks, stock ponds, and ditches under the Clean Water Act.

If the EPA's proposal goes through, the Federal Government could expand its regulatory authority from navigable waters such as lakes and rivers to the ditches on your grandfather's property or the dry creek bed behind your house. That is what we are talking about. This could lead to untold compliance costs and bureaucratic wrangling for ordinary families and literally cripple farmers and businesses.

The EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers proposed Clean Water Act jurisdictional rule seeks to redefine "waters of the United States" which would effectively eliminate the Clean Water Act's "navigable waters" provision.

Congress specifically referenced "navigable waters" in the Clean Water Act to guarantee limits to Federal authority.

Bodies of water currently deemed "waters of the United States" are subject to multiple regulatory requirements under the Clean Water Act, including permitting and reporting, enforcement, mitigation, and citizen suits. Despite strong bipartisan opposition in Congress, the EPA and the Corps have relentlessly pursued an expansion of the definition of "waters of the United States."

Additionally, the EPA is pressing forward despite two recent Supreme Court cases that expressly rejected the Agency's broad assertions of regulatory authority and made it clear that not all bodies of water are subject to Federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act.

If the EPA's power grab is left unchecked, few bodies of water will be able to escape the regulatory reach of the Obama EPA.

This proposed new definition could apply to a countless number of small wetlands and creeks that are typically regulated at the State level. More specifically, the proposed rule extends the reach of Federal regulatory authority by adding "interstate wetlands" and all "adjacent waters" to the definition of "Waters of the United States."

It also deems all tributaries to be categorically jurisdictional, and for the first time ever ditches—ditches—are defined as jurisdictional tributaries. This is cause for concern. This should be disturbing and troubling to all Americans—subjecting roadside, irrigation, and storm water ditches to regulation under the Clean Water Act, which would have practical consequences not fully evaluated by the EPA.

These bodies of water are hardly navigable and are, in many cases, seasonal or sporadic depending on the weather. The proposal also states that the EPA could regulate water on a case-by-case basis—dangerous development for a regulatory agency. The American public is right to be wary of the EPA granting itself such discretion. A case-by-case approach is confusing and will inevitably lead to even more litigation.

This proposal exceeds the established authority of the EPA by infringing upon what has long been a State responsibility under the Clean Water Act. All States—my State of South Dakota, Senator ROBERTS' State of Kansas, Senator HOEVEN's State of North Dakota—have an inherent interest in providing for the well-being of their citizens and businesses and ensuring safe and enduring water resources that play a large role in achieving that end.

My home State of South Dakota's No. 1 industry is agriculture. We help to feed the world. This cannot be done without clean and dependable sources of water for our farmers and ranchers. This expansion of the EPA's regulatory authority would have significant economic impact for property owners who would likely be hit with new Federal

permits, compliance costs, and threats of significant fines.

Agriculture is a time-sensitive business, and the burdens this proposal would place on South Dakota farmers would strain the ability of producers to fertilize, to plant, and to irrigate when the seasons and weather conditions dictate. Rather, permits and regulations would bind the ability of producers to get their crops in when they need to and limit what they could do to ensure successful yields.

Tourism is also a vital industry in my State of South Dakota. The Black Hills, which are home to Mount Rushmore, draw nearly 3 million visitors each year. The rugged beauty of the Black Hills depends upon the responsible water management of the State and county governments. According to a letter I just received from the Pennington County Board of Commissioners, which includes much of the Black Hills, their ability to manage the water resources in the Black Hills area is greatly threatened by the EPA's proposed rule.

Similarly, South Dakota's thriving hunting industry is sustained in part by practical and responsible water management, allowing ducks and pheasants to thrive in prairie potholes and creeks. These are connected to waters already responsibly managed by the State of South Dakota. Another layer of Federal regulation will only add needless costs to protecting these waters.

Additionally, cities in my State are already struggling to grow under new taxes and regulations imposed by the Obama administration. The EPA's latest overreach would provide environmental groups with yet another powerful tool to delay and prevent development and interfere with land use activities on property owned by homeowners, small businesses, and municipalities.

I have heard from South Dakotans in nearly every industry, and the common consensus is this: This rule is bad for business—certainly in places such as South Dakota and Kansas and North Dakota and Wyoming but, I would argue, all across this country.

So I am proud to stand with my colleagues on the floor today in support of legislation that would stop the EPA's proposed Clean Water Act jurisdictional rule and protect farmers, ranchers, and homeowners across the country from the latest regulatory overreach by the Obama administration.

Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota, I think, will carry on with the colloquy between our colleagues from the Midwestern part of the country and speak to the impacts of this ill-proposed rule on the people they represent in their respective States.

I yield for the Senator from North Dakota.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we be allowed

until 10:28 a.m. for the purposes of the colloquy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be here this morning with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, as well as the esteemed Senators from both Kansas and Wyoming, to talk about this regulation that is clearly an overreach by the EPA. It needs to be addressed. We have measures to address it.

As the Senator from South Dakota said so well, this is a regulation that is a huge problem for our farmers and ranchers, but really, as he said, we have been hearing from almost every industry sector that this is a big-time problem that needs to be addressed, and needs to be addressed now.

So, as I said, we have legislation both in committee—I have legislation in the Appropriations Committee, in the Energy and Water Subcommittee, that would address it—and the good Senator from Wyoming has legislation that he has filed, and he is requesting a floor vote.

But in both cases, whether it is in committee or here on the floor, what we are saying is give us a chance to vote on this issue. This is an important issue for the American people and Senators need to indicate where they stand. I do not know why everybody should not be proud to do that—to vote on this regulatory overreach and to address this challenge for the American people. It is a very straightforward issue.

That is what we are here to discuss and debate this morning, and we sincerely hope, as we continue to highlight this very important problem, the leadership of this body is going to step up on behalf of the American people and allow—allow—the Senate to address it through its rightful duty, which is to vote on issues important to the American people.

To continue this important dialog, I turn to the Senator from Kansas and ask for his comments on behalf of his constituents in his State in terms of what he is hearing and the problems this waters of the U.S. proposed regulation put forward by the EPA creates in the great State of Kansas.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding. I thank Senator HOEVEN for his leadership on this issue and for bringing this issue to the attention of all Members, more especially those of us in our conference, but this should be a bipartisan effort.

I rise today to join my colleagues in discussing yet another—yet another—job-stifling and unjustified regulation proposed by this administration.

The EPA, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Department of Agriculture—what? the three horsemen of the regulatory apocalypse—have pro-

posed a rule that after careful review and study we believe would allow the EPA to further expand its control of private property—control of private property—under the guise of the Clean Water Act.

They claim that the proposed "Waters of the United States" rule "simply clarifies their scope of jurisdiction." Well, here is the catch: The "clarification" is from categorically classifying so-called "other waters" as regulated, even if the water cannot be navigated and was previously outside of their authority.

This proposal is another example of why many Kansans, many farmers and ranchers from Wyoming, South Dakota, North Dakota, feel their way of life is under attack by the Federal Government's overreach and overregulation.

To date, the Kansas associations of grain and feed, agribusiness retailers, ethanol producers, soybeans, wheat growers, pork producers, livestock, watersheds, golf course superintendents, and the Kansas Cooperative Council all have opposed this rule. Similar organizations in Wyoming and North Dakota and South Dakota and all across farm country have also been in contact with their Senators. These organizations and their members fear the EPA will use this rule to further regulate farmers and ranchers, as well as other normal land uses, such as building homes.

If finalized, this rule could have the EPA requiring a permit for ordinary fieldwork or for the construction of a fence or for even planting crops near certain waters.

Kansans are justifiably worried that the permits would be time-consuming, costly, and that the EPA could ultimately deny the permits, even for longstanding and normal practices—even practices that help the environment.

A friend of mine, Kansas farmer Jim Sipes—he is out there in Manter, KS; that is way out there; that is way out there by the Colorado border; he still has not gotten much rain after 3 years—he explains his view and said: "The only thing that is clear and certain is that, under this rule, it will be more difficult to farm and ranch, or make changes to the land—even if those changes would benefit the environment." He knows what he is talking about.

For the folks back home, the issue of the EPA trying to control more water, whether it is actually "navigable," is not new. We have had this before. We have been down a similar road before with the agency wanting to regulate all of the water in the country, even small farm ponds, I would tell my colleagues, that no self-respecting duck would ever land on.

Now, I think maybe there is a file, I say to Senator HOEVEN—I think there is a file down there in the basement of the EPA. It must be a big one: rural fugitive dust; the navigable waters situation; endangered species, so there is the taking of farmers' ground to force

them to plant native prairie grass to save the lesser prairie chicken, which we cannot even find; and on and on and on and on. I think it must be labeled: What Drives Farmers and Ranchers Crazy. And about every second foggy night, why, somebody pulls open that file and we go through the whole thing again. It is not as though we have not done this before on this issue.

After personally calling on the EPA and Army Corps to withdraw the proposed rule, I want to make sure the expansion of regulatory jurisdiction over “Waters of the United States”—let’s shelve it for good. Let’s shelve it for good.

Last week I joined the distinguished Senator from Wyoming Mr. BARRASSO and the majority of our caucus in introducing straightforward legislation that prohibits the Administrator of the EPA and the Secretary of the Army—the Secretary of the Army, for goodness sakes—from finalizing the rule or trying a similar regulation in the future. Put the file back. Just file it away. Maybe put it somewhere where the hard drive is that Lois Lerner lost.

We will continue working here in the Senate, as well as the House, to either convince the administration to back off of this proposal or, if necessary, to block the agencies from moving forward. We have stopped this type of foolishness before, and I expect we will be successful again.

I thank my colleagues for their arduous efforts.

I say to Senator HOEVEN, thank you for leading this effort.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I would like to thank, again, the Senator from Kansas. He is somebody who has been involved in agriculture for—well, he is still a very young man—he is somebody who has been involved in agriculture for a long time and certainly understands what goes into farming.

Think about it. Farmers and ranchers work the land, but that is also their home. Who knows the land better? Who knows the streams and the potholes and the ditches and the roads, who knows their land better than a farmer or a rancher? And who is more concerned about it? Really. Who is more concerned about it? That farmer or somebody who works at the EPA here in Washington, DC? That is important to think about as we look at this kind of regulatory overreach that goes to the very private property rights that are the foundation of this country.

I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his leadership and for the legislation he has put together that he has filed and that we should be voting on right now that I am very pleased to cosponsor.

I would ask the Senator from Wyoming for his comments on this issue and his legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to thank my friend and col-

league, the former Governor of North Dakota, now the Senator from North Dakota, who knows these issues very well. And I would like to thank the Senator from Kansas, who talked about the administration’s overreach and overregulations and the impact it has on the economy of the United States.

There is very disturbing news out this morning reported by Reuters. The headline: “Bad to worse: US economy shrank more than expected in Q1 [of this year].” U.S. economy shrank more than expected in Q1 of this year.

The U.S. economy contracted, not grew, not stayed the same but contracted at a much steeper pace than previously estimated in the first quarter. The Commerce Department said on Wednesday that gross domestic product fell at a 2.9-percent annual rate, the economy’s worst performance in 5 years—worst performance in 5 years.

It is because of the overreach, the overregulation that is coming out of this administration. That is why I rise in support with my colleagues and my colleagues who have very serious concerns about the EPA’s proposed Clean Water Act jurisdictional rule.

Many if not all of these colleagues recently joined me in introducing the Protecting Water and Property Rights of 2014 Act. In fact, 34 Senators have cosponsored this bill. More continue to join the important effort. They have joined this effort because this important and consequential legislation restricts the expansion of Federal authority by this EPA, which the EPA is trying to use to encompass all wet areas of farms, of ranches, suburban homes all across America.

More specifically, this bill eliminates the administration’s proposed rule to implement the expansion of such Federal authority. Through this recently proposed rule, Federal agencies are attempting to expand the definitions of waters of the United States. They want to include ditches and other dry areas where water flows only for a short duration after a rainfall, but the government wants to control even that.

Federal regulations have never defined ditches and other upland drainage features as waters of the United States, but this proposed rule does. It will have a huge impact on farmers, on ranchers, on small businesses that need to put a shovel in the ground to make a living. The rule amounts to a Federal user fee for farmers and ranchers to use their own land after it rains.

It forces suburban homeowners to pay the EPA and Army Corps to use their backyards after a storm. Let’s be clear what is proposed in this rule. It takes money away from family farmers and ranchers who just want to grow crops, raise cattle, and it taxes suburban middle-class families who just want to recreate in their own backyard without Uncle Sam bankrupting them for the privilege.

This is the worst thing I think we can do to Americans in this economy, an economy, as I say, that is shrink-

ing—a shrinking economy, not just stagnant, not just sitting there but actually shrinking. That is why my legislation is endorsed by the American Farm Bureau, as well as the American Land Rights Association. It is because they know how devastating this rule is to farmers, to ranchers, to homeowners, and to other small businesses.

Despite what this administration may say and has said about providing “flexibility”—they use that word—for farmers and ranchers in the proposed rule, the farmers and ranchers of America are not deceived. They will not be misled by this administration. According to the June edition of the publication *National Cattlemen*, an article entitled: “EPA’s Ag Exemptions for WOTUS”—waters of the United States.

Let me point out that the National Cattlemen—it is the trusted leader and definitive voice of the beef industry, the trusted leader and definitive voice of the beef industry, and the official publication of the National Cattlemen’s Beef Association. What that front page article says is:

Although agriculture exemptions are briefly included, they do not come close—

Do not come close—

to meeting the needs of the cattlemen and women across the country.

The president of the National Cattlemen’s Beef Association, McCan, stated in the article:

For example, wet spots or areas in a pasture that have standing water, under this rule could potentially be affected. We now need permission to travel and move cattle across these types of areas.

The article lists some other major areas of agriculture not exempted by the EPA’s proposed rule:

Activities not covered by the exemptions include introduction of new cultivation techniques, planting different crops, changing crops to pasture, changing pasture to crops, changing cropland to orchards and to vineyards and changing crop land to nurseries.

Congress never intended the Clean Water Act to be used this way. The Senate, under Democratic control, never brought legislation such as the Clean Water Restoration Act to the floor that would have removed the word “navigable” from the Clean Water Act. Why? Because they knew it would have been defeated.

In fact, 52 bipartisan Members, a bipartisan group, a majority of the Senators voted for the Barrasso amendment that rejected the EPA’s proposed guidance to seize all State waters during the Water Resources Development Act. Yet this proposed rule by the administration is circumventing Congress by effectively writing “navigable” out of the Clean Water Act.

Just as troubling as ignoring Congressional intent, the proposed rule disregards the fundamental tenet embodied in two decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. Those are decisions that limit Federal jurisdiction. It is particularly troubling that the proposed rule allows the Army Corps and EPA to

regulate waters now considered entirely under State jurisdiction.

This unprecedented exercise of power will allow the EPA to trump States rights and wipe out the authority of State and local governments to meet local land and water use decisions. It is particularly troubling when we have seen no evidence—no evidence at all—that the States are misusing or otherwise failing to meet their responsibilities. Enormous resources will be needed to expand the Clean Water Act Federal Regulatory Program.

Not only will there be a host of landowners and project proponents who will now be subject to the Clean Water Act's mandates and the cost of obtaining permits, but an increase in the number of permits needed will lead to longer delays in actually getting the permits. Increased delays in securing permits will impede a host of economic activities in 50 States, cost thousands of American jobs.

Farming and ranching, commercial and residential real estate development, electric transmission, transportation projects, bridge repairs, energy development, and mining will all be negatively affected. This is at a time when the United States has seen our economy shrink. The Reuters story today talks about shrinkage much more than predicted previously. Regulations such as this continue to damage America, damage our country, damage our families, damage our communities, damage the hard-working men and woman who want to go to work, put food on the table for their kids, raise their families, and go to work, but yet we have an administration that does not seem to see, is blinded by a role of big government. They are blinded from seeing the impact these onerous, expensive, burdensome regulations are having on the American public and certainly on our economy, as pointed out today in this news release from Reuters about the shrinking of the American economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his leadership on this important issue and pick up on a point he just expressed: Why are we not demanding in this body that we vote on legislation to address this proposed regulation?

As he said so clearly and eloquently, this is an issue this Congress rejected. So now when one of the agencies, the EPA, goes around Congress to set up a proposed regulation that does something the Congress expressly rejected, why in the world are we not voting? It is our responsibility and our right to do so.

America's farmers and ranchers and entrepreneurs go to work every day to build a stronger nation. Thanks to those hard-working men and women, we live in a country where there is affordable food at the grocery store, where a dynamic private sector offers Americans the opportunity to achieve

a brighter future. In these difficult economic times, the Federal Government should be doing all it can to empower those who grow our food and those who create jobs. Yet instead regulators are stifling growth with burdensome regulations that generate cost and uncertainty.

Look at the economic data, as the Senator from Wyoming said, that came out this morning. What are we doing stifling that entrepreneurial activity, that entrepreneurship, that creativity that makes the American economy go? This proposed regulation is an example of that. It touches almost every industry.

We are talking about our farmers and ranchers, but it goes across all industry sectors. The proposed rule by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency to regulate the waters of the United States is exactly the type of regulation that is hurting our economy, hurting our entrepreneurs, hurting our farmers, and our ranchers.

The waters of the United States rule greatly expands the scope of the Clean Water Act, regulations over America's streams and wetlands. If we take a look at a chart I brought, I know it is a little hard to see, but it demonstrates the incredible reach of this proposed regulation.

If we look at the chart, we can see it is a real power grab that will enable the EPA to stretch its tentacles far into the countryside and far beyond.

It is not just our farmers and ranchers and water in a ditch or water in a field that is there for maybe 1 week when it rains and the rest of the time it is dry, it affects construction, it affects powerplants, it affects stormwater drainage. I cannot think of anything it is not going to affect.

Is that how our country works now? Instead of the people who are duly elected to pass laws for this country, we stand here and we do not get to vote on any of these issues we were elected to vote on, and someone who is not elected at the EPA or the Corps, they put regulations in place that affect virtually every single American. Is that how this works now? Is that what it has come to?

Because that is exactly what is happening. That is exactly what is going on. The Supreme Court has found that Federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act extends to navigable waters. I do not think anyone is arguing about the EPA's ability to regulate the Missouri River or other navigable bodies of water—rivers, lakes—but the Supreme Court also made clear that not all bodies of water are under the EPA's jurisdiction.

So under a significant nexus determination, the EPA has decided: We do not care what the Supreme Court said. We are going to make sure they are all under our jurisdiction, not pursuant to any law. We are going to put a regulation in place that enables us to do whatever we want with any body of

water, not just navigable bodies of water.

Again, that is what I have tried to show on this chart. Ephemeral streams, tributaries, all waters deemed adjacent to any navigable body, including dry ditches, including water in fields that may be there for a short period of time, runoff from storm sewers, you name it.

That is not the intent of the law. That is not the intent of the Supreme Court ruling. That is why it is so important that we address it. That is what we propose to do. In the legislation we put forward, both on the floor, in the bill filed by the Senator from Wyoming, the legislation I have offered in Energy and Water, we straightforwardly, we simply and straightforwardly address this regulation.

How much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I would have no objection as long as equal time is added to the block that follows for the Democrats.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification?

Mr. HOEVEN. I have no objection.

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

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, that is our point. We understand that people bring different points of view to this deliberative body, but the point is this: This is an important issue that affects virtually all Americans, that affects our economy, that affects our farmers, our ranchers, our businesses, the energy sector. You name it.

When we have something of this importance, we have an absolute responsibility to the people of this country to show where we stand on the issue, meaning we have a responsibility to vote on this and the other important issues before this body. That is what we are asking for.

We are saying everybody has a right to bring their point of view and their opinion, but we all have a right and a responsibility to vote on these important issues. That is what we are asking for, a vote on this important issue for the benefit of the American people.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, it is our understanding that Democrats control the next 32 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Democrats control the next 30 minutes.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CARDIN. I ask unanimous consent that Senator WHITEHOUSE and I be allowed to speak in a colloquy with other Members or to yield time during that 30 minutes.