

from coordinating their activities under our antitrust laws, Congress permits this kind of coordination by professional sports teams, particularly in the area of pooling their broadcast rights and television contracts—the very means that enable them to spread their message and create that public image.

Teams in smaller media markets are able to remain competitive with their larger counterparts because of those benefits and the fact that the governing national leagues can evenly distribute resources—again, through coordination, agreements, combinations that would violate the law for any other corporation.

This exemption was the product of significant debate and analysis in Congress and around the country when it was granted. It was first established in 1961, and the Judiciary Committee noted even then that it was not intended to be absolute and that it was not to be used for unfair competition and that there was a public trust and obligation.

In 1976 the House of Representatives convened what it called a “Select Committee on Professional Sports” which prepared detailed reports on “the large number of off-the-field problems that affected all four of the professional sports,” including “both violence that involves participants in the sports as well as violence involving spectators of the sports.” We know the problems in these leagues include not only domestic violence but also the failure to address injuries such as concussions, drug abuse, and other problems that have been reported.

If anything, in the more than 50 years since the exemption was first granted, the prominence of the four professional sporting leagues in the American media landscape has only increased. The leagues have a tremendous effect, again, reaching into every aspect of American life, on programming, pricing, advertising, and more.

A lot has changed over the past 50 years, not least of which is our understanding of the harms of domestic violence and the importance of workplace policies that protect women, minorities, and other members of society. Yet the NFL’s response to the Ray Rice incident came right out of the 1960s—right out of an episode of “Mad Men.”

Our laws and our practices and our culture must change. Most leagues, most athletes, most managers, and most teams play by the rules on and off the field. But, unfortunately, these deep-seated problems are not new. This special status can no longer be a blank check. It can no longer be granted permanently. It must be reviewable and the teams and the league held accountable. The era of the blank check for sports teams must end. The special benefits must be dependent on the leagues’ fulfilling their positions of trust and special responsibility.

I will be proposing legislation to sunset the leagues’ special antitrust treat-

ment, ending the blanket antitrust exemption and making it renewable every 5 years. The exemption should depend on the leagues’ acting consistently with their public trust and complying with ethical and legal standards that both protect and oversee players and that keep the teams accountable to their fans. Their fans deserve better.

To ensure that Congress has accurate information, my legislation will establish a commission, like many that have existed in the past, to monitor the leagues’ record of corporate citizenship. The commission would include representatives with special knowledge of issues that were proven to be a problem for the leagues, such as the heads of the Department of Justice’s Office of Violence Against Women, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Surgeon General, and the commission would be responsible for submitting a report to Congress in advance of the vote to reauthorize and renew the antitrust exemption.

Other groups would have an opportunity to be heard and to submit their views, and there would be hearings, meetings, and other exchanges that would give all an opportunity to be heard on this vital topic. I hope the Congress will have hearings as soon as possible on this issue.

I believe the professional sports leagues, and in particular the NFL, have an obligation to adopt policies that train players on domestic violence—more than lip service, more than check-the-box orientation settings—and, most important, to punish acts of abuse and promote awareness of this terrible crime. They have an obligation to act in accordance with due process and establish rules that treat more stringently and strictly this crime of domestic violence, in accordance with standards that give the players the right and opportunity to be heard.

But maybe more importantly than all else, these leagues should be accountable to help the survivors and victims, to provide funds out of the tens of billions in their profits to support these services that are more necessary than ever. They should support the survivors—most of them women—who come forward and have the incredible courage, bravery, and strength to break with a situation of domestic violence. It is at that point of maximum danger and turmoil in their lives that they most need to reach someone and have someone reach them to provide the counseling and advocacy they need and deserve at that moment of turmoil and pain.

Congress, the courts, all of us, have a responsibility to do more and to do better and to demand of professional sports leagues that they do more and do better.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, at some point today or tomorrow the Senate will hastily consider, and likely pass, a massive, hodgepodge spending bill to fund every last Department and program within our Federal Government—even those programs and those Departments we know don’t work, even those programs and those Departments where we know there is a lot of abuse and misuse of sacred Federal funds. The alternative, if we can call it even an alternative at all—and the only alternative—is to deny funding for every last Department and every last program within the Federal Government—even those programs and those Departments we know are absolutely essential.

All or nothing—those are our only options, the only options we are given. We have no other choice made available to us. This is government on autopilot or, alternatively, government without an engine.

The problem is that by funding the Federal Government with a massive patchwork spending bill, we force the American people to choose between two equally bad, two equally unacceptable options: Pay for everything in government or pay for nothing at all; either fund the entire Federal Government tomorrow at exactly the same level we are funding it today or fund nothing within the Federal Government, not even to pay our soldiers, our sailors, our airmen, our marines, our judges, or not even to provide care for our veterans or support for the most vulnerable among us.

This kind of all-or-nothing proposition is dysfunctional, it is antidemocratic, and it prevents Congress from doing its job, which, I remind my colleagues, is to represent the American people and to be faithful stewards of their money—of the taxpayers’ money—with which they have entrusted their Congress.

During the month of August, I held a long series of townhall meetings across my State, the great State of Utah. Whether I was in Cache County in the northern end of the State or in Washington County in the opposite direction or somewhere in between, the people of Utah, Democrats and Republicans alike, were clear about what they wanted. They were clear about the fact that they were demanding action. They wanted action in Washington. Their concerns weren’t always the same. Some worried most about the public lands. Others were anxious about the economy. Many, of course, were troubled by the growing crisis along our southern border.

They were all looking for answers. They were all looking for solutions from someone. Everywhere I went they asked me: What are you going to do? What are you going to do to get our economy back on track? What are you going to do to deal with many of the problems within our Federal Government that seem to go unaddressed for

far too long? I would tell them: As a matter of law and by operation of our Constitution, Members of Congress have certain tools to address all of these concerns, but none of these powers is greater than the power of the purse. This is the power to allocate money, to fund the government, to fund its operations. It is what enables Congress, and only Congress, to reform dysfunctional government.

Encompassed within the power to give money is the power, necessarily, to withhold money. In this case the power of the purse is the most potent and the most effective instrument Congress can use to hold the executive branch accountable.

So when the administration fails to follow the law, as our current administration has done so freely and so frequently, Congress can demand answers and accountability by using the power of the purse as leverage.

As several of these townhall conversations continued, in the course of those townhall conversations, I began to notice that at this point in my answer, many people began to look hopeful—hoping that perhaps something could actually get done in Washington; hoping that perhaps some of the problems within our Federal Government could be corrected, could be reined in, could be turned around and set on a better course—but then I would have to break the bad news, and here is the bad news.

I would have to tell them all those things their representatives should be able to do and have an obligation to do—such as fixing broken government programs and ensuring the solvency of Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and impeding lawless actions by the executive branch—but simply cannot get done because the Democratic leadership in the Senate insists that our Federal Government operate on autopilot.

This is the problem with the continuing resolution. When Congress has only one opportunity to exercise its power of the purse by voting for or against an all-or-nothing spending package and an all-inclusive, all-or-nothing spending bill, Congress has essentially no opportunity to exercise its power of the purse—at least not in a meaningful way, at least not in a way that enables Congress to demand accountability from Government.

In the continuing resolution we will consider tomorrow, there are several provisions that deserve their own consideration and debate, such as reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank, extending the Internet Tax Freedom Act, and authorizing military action in Syria. None of these measures—and certainly not something that could put American lives at risk—should be hurried through on an all-or-nothing vote.

This is why the continuing resolution matters for everyone in this country. It is the principal reason our government is so dysfunctional and so unaccountable. A government on autopilot leaves Congress effectively paralyzed—

powerless to implement meaningful government reforms and powerless to hold the President and the President's administration accountable for their actions.

This is not how government is supposed to operate. This is not how this government is ever supposed to be allowed to operate. It doesn't have to be this way. There is a better way. Indeed, as you can see on this chart, until just a few years ago, the better way was the only way. The House has done this and it is still doing it today.

Let me explain what this demonstrates right here. Freestanding appropriations bills that were passed by the Congress for fiscal year 2006—we had 11 separate individualized freestanding appropriations bills. To put that in context, that is more freestanding independent appropriations bills than Congress has enacted in all of the fiscal years ever since then—just in one year. That, of course, used to be the norm. It no longer is. In fact, lately, we are not doing any of these things.

It is important to point out that the House of Representatives still routinely passes freestanding appropriations measures. For fiscal year 2015, the upcoming fiscal year, the House of Representatives has passed seven such bills. The Senate has passed zero. Not only has the Senate passed none of its own free-standing appropriations bills, it has refused even to vote on any of the seven appropriations bills passed by the House of Representatives.

The fact is that before the Democratic leadership took control of the Senate, Congress would spend most of its time during the spring and summer of each year discussing, debating, amending, and eventually figuring out how much taxpayer money to spend and on what. Congress would consider separate spending bills, one by one, individually. Each of these bills would allocate a certain amount of money to fund the Departments, the agencies, and the programs within a certain area of government, organized by government functions such as defense, transportation, homeland security or health care.

Each spending bill originated in one of the corresponding subcommittees in the House and in the Senate. This is what we call the appropriations process. It makes sense that it would take up most of our time because as Members of Congress we have a solemn obligation to represent the people and to be faithful stewards of taxpayer money—of the money that many Americans spend many months of their lives each year just to earn so that they can send it to Washington, DC.

The American taxpayer deserves better. The American taxpayer should be able to expect more out of Congress. Instead, they have come to expect so much less.

That is how Congress used to operate, according to its own rules, according to historic precedent, and—more to

the point—according to basic principles of common sense. Alas, times have changed. What Congress used to deliberate on for months, we now rush through in a single afternoon without opportunity for amendment, without opportunity for a full debate.

What used to be the subject of open and robust debate is now trivialized and treated as a mere formality, as a mere technical requirement to be dispensed with and discarded as quickly as it arrives.

The American people deserve better. Indeed, as I discovered while visiting with the people from one corner of Utah to the other, the American people demand that we do better. I think we can do better. In fact, I know we can. We have in the past. We will in the future, but we have to get the regular order appropriations process back on track.

We need to dispense, once and for all, with this mindset that says we are going to fund the government with one bill. You are going to have one opportunity to vote on any and all matters relating to the funding of the Federal Government. It is a binary choice. We fund everything at current levels or we fund nothing. We keep it running just the way it is with no opportunity for meaningful reform or we don't fund anything at all and we accept all of the heartache and all of the difficulty that goes along with this. This is wrong. It violates our laws and violates our procedures and it violates common sense.

We as a Congress have asked the American people over and over to expect less. I am here to tell each of my colleagues that it is time for the American people not to expect less. It is time for the American people to expect more. They are expecting more. They are expecting freedom. They are expecting for us to honor them by debating and discussing and voting on how we are going to spend their money.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The Senator from Montana.

THE AMERICAN DREAM

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I was born during the baby boom in Butte, MT. It was a boom time for our economy. Millions of kids such as me grew up expecting the boom years to go on forever. Things weren't always easy, especially in a tough blue-collar town like Butte. But it was still easier in those days to believe that the American dream was within your grasp. Put in your time and you can earn a good living. Work hard and you can play hard.

Unfortunately, I am less confident in the American dream for today's young people unless politicians can put their partisanship aside and put the interests of this country ahead of their own. I am hopeful that this Congress can once again behave like statesmen from half a century ago, when the boom times of the 1960s also produced restraint. I grew up in the morning shadow of the continental divide. Butte was

surrounded by some of the best fly fishing in North America and huge areas of land known as primitive areas.

Some of those blue-ribbon streams were separated by the smallest of divides from the most polluted waters in America. Some of those primitive areas shared borders with the most valuable hard rock mines and timber cuts in the country. Those same resources continue to support thousands of jobs in Montana. But the boom times of the 1960s proved how wasteful and damaging unlimited production can be.

Today I applaud the lessons of restraint. This month is the 50th anniversary of the passage of the Wilderness Act. Senators on this same floor in 1964 turned the primitive areas and administrative wilderness areas of Montana and 12 other States into permanent protected areas.

That same year they also passed the visionary Land and Water Conservation Fund. Several of the original wilderness areas are in Montana, including one of the largest, the Bob Marshall Wilderness. In Montana we just call it the Bob. Imagine a Congress with the foresight to create a whole category of restraint. Anyone that says the American dream is gone for good has never visited the Bob.

Last month I had the opportunity to hike with a local group of Montanans up 2,000 feet to Headquarters Pass on the Rocky Mountain Front. On the trail, we met a herd of mountain goats. When we got to the pass, we stood under the windy shoulder of Rocky Mountain peaks and looked into the Bob.

Today I am the proud sponsor of an important made-in-Montana bill that would keep this land the way it is and add to the legacy of 1964. The Rocky Mountain Front Heritage Act, first introduced three years ago, would protect almost 300,000 acres of public land. Today I urge my colleagues to move a public lands package forward this year in order to reward the collective efforts of so many Americans who work so hard on bills like the Rocky Mountain Front Heritage Act.

The American dream today has a new challenge because of the Wilderness Act. A small portion of our public lands has been set aside and made available forever for all Americans to enjoy in Montana. We call this our outdoor heritage. Despite news stories about the perennial and terrible idea of giving away this heritage, support for public lands in Montana remains deep and wide. The reason goes to the heart of what it means to be American. The American dream isn't just about having a job. It is about where we live and how we live.

In Montana, our public lands to support trout or elk or whatever adventure Montanans seek are part of that dream, whether they are a boiler-maker, a teacher or an outfitter.

It doesn't hurt that tourism has become a huge part of our economy in Montana. Today outdoor recreation

supports 64,000 jobs in our State and almost \$6 billion in revenue each and every year. Like many Montanans, I am frustrated with how long it takes to conduct a timber sale or complete an environmental analysis on potential projects.

We need to get our forests healthy and working again, creating good jobs and making our forests more resilient to wildfires. Even simple projects get tied up in redtape and our rural communities and the land itself suffer for it. But this frustration should not blind us to our incredible heritage of untrampled public land owned by you and me and every American.

Rather than government shutdowns and public land selloffs, I urge this Congress to find the same wisdom to look ahead 50 years from today. We need to support local collaboration and fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Bills such as the Rocky Mountain Front Heritage Act, the North Fork Watershed Protection Act, the East Rosebud Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and the Forest Jobs and Recreation Act deserve every Senator's support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. CORKER. It is my understanding the leader is on his way down. I have a unanimous consent request that I would like to offer. I know that he wants to say a word. I will preliminary make some comments. When he gets here, out of respect for his time, I will ask that unanimous consent request.

Let me move on by saying that the President gave a speech a week ago. We have a hearing today in the Foreign Relations Committee. Secretary Kerry and others will assess our strategy in Iraq and Syria related to ISIL.

I just want to say these obviously are very important decisions. One of the pieces of this strategy is that instead of the President coming and asking for an authorization for the use of military force—which, in my opinion, is the sound judgment, to come and ask us for that support so the American people are behind this effort, by virtue of the House and Senate taking that up. They are not going to do that. Instead they are asking for the authority to do a very, very small piece of that, which is to train and equip some members of the moderate, vetted Syrian opposition and to do so in the country of Saudi Arabia.

So they are asking for an authorization to do that overtly. It is something about which many people have questions. It is something that for many years, for some time, I have supported and actually been disappointed that the administration has left hanging the people of Syria whom we encourage now to take on Assad.

So that is a very important vote, a vote that all of us should take as a freestanding vote. But instead what is getting ready to happen is coming over

from the House is a continuing resolution bill that funds the government. So instead of voting on the continuing resolution, which is a totally separate matter, and voting on arming the vetted moderate opposition the way the President has requested, as a separate vote so, No. 1, we have the opportunity individually to weigh in on those two measures separately, as the House is doing right now—instead, what is going to happen, as I understand from the majority leader, is we are going to take up that vote in a combined way. I think that is a poor way to run the Senate. It is a poor way for the people of the United States to understand where we are on important issues.

Just to give an example, I do not support the funding levels in the CR. I voted against the Murray-Ryan budget. I couldn't believe that in such a short amount of time we were willing to do away with the budget caps we thought so important to the fiscal well-being of this Nation. So I do not support the funding levels for the continuing resolution and had planned to vote against it.

Now there is a piece in it that is an important foreign policy piece that I think needs further debate, where we are authorizing the arming and training of the moderate opposition through December 11 as a part of this bill. That, to me, is an inappropriate way for us to do business. I think every Member of this body ought to have the opportunity to vote on each of those.

So the request I am going to make when the leader gets here is not to change any of the wordage—I realize time is of the essence. We have two bodies that sometimes do not act in concert in appropriate ways. But my unanimous consent request is to ask that properly these be separated, the language be identically the same.

So what I have done is I have at the desk a bill that lays out the authorization for arming and training the vetted moderate opposition in Saudi Arabia and other places. I have that exact language that is coming over from the House so that the Presiding Officer, myself, and others can weigh in on that issue. Once that issue is dealt with—again, it would take 15 or 20 or 30 minutes for that to occur—we could then move over to the continuing resolution, which, again, has a different set of supporters, generally speaking.

So I do wish this body would debate the issues of great importance to our Nation. I know that in this hearing with Secretary Kerry, on both sides of the aisle there are numerous questions about how this strategy is going to work in Syria and how, with no ground force on the ground and us planning to train people in a very short amount of time, a very small amount of people—we are not going to give them very sophisticated equipment—how that ground game, that ground effort is going to be effective. I wish this body would take that up and debate it. To me, it is an important issue. It is an

issue that I have supported for some time. At the same time, the efficacy of it has changed.

One of the things that is fascinating to me—General Dempsey yesterday: All of a sudden, we are going to train them.

By the way, they have been organized because they want Assad out. They have been fighting against Assad in Syria. But we are going to train them to fight ISIS or ISIL, which has not been the rallying entity for the Free Syrian Army to organize.

So, look, I plan to support publicly, as I am right now, this first phase of arming and training them because I have been pushing for it for so long. I worry about its efficacy. It seems as if the goals of it now are very different. But I am OK authorizing that until December 11 and we can hear more about it. But I do not support the funding levels in the CR. This is not an appropriate way for us to do business.

I am going to ask unanimous consent—I hope the majority leader is going to be here in a minute. I would like to get back to the hearing on Syria that we are having in foreign relations. I understand he may well be on the way.

With that—as a matter of fact, I may pause for a minute. Let me just make a point I made earlier with Secretary Kerry at the hearing. I do not want to debate whether the President has the legal authority to conduct a war, a multiyear war, a war that many people say may take up to a decade in another country against another enemy. I do not want to debate whether he legally can do that. I know he is tying himself to the 2001 authorization, which I assure you no one was contemplating. But I do not want to debate that. I know there are all kinds of article II people—all kinds of people who believe the President can do almost anything he wishes relative to military engagement.

I just want to talk about how lacking in judgment it is for three people—the President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of State—to attempt to do this over a multiyear period, in a different country, with a different enemy, and not come to us. That lacks in judgment. That lacks in judgment because bad things are going to happen. Mistakes are going to be made. Five hundred thirty-five Monday-morning quarterbacks make no sense. Holding the country together is what is important. So selling that plan, selling the details, having us have the opportunity to tease out and understand how this is going to work is an important part of the process that they are skipping.

I see the majority leader is here. I know he is busy. I thank him for coming to the floor.

I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the two leaders prior to the consideration of H.J. Res. 124, the CR, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of my bill—the exact same language as coming

over from the House—which is at the desk—that is the same language as included in the CR regarding Syria; that there be up to 4 hours of debate followed by a vote on passage of my bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, my friend from Tennessee is a fine Senator. He has the interests of the State of Tennessee every step of the way and, of course, our country. So my statement here has nothing to do with the kind of man he is and the kind of Senator he is.

I have just left my office, where I watched the second of three votes in the House. The House has voted on the continuing resolution. It passed by an overwhelming margin over there. The purpose of that is to stop another government shutdown. The continuing resolution includes language on training and equipping the Syrian opposition. That bill will come over here in a matter of an hour or two. The House has chosen how it wishes to address these two matters; that is, the CR and arming and training the Syrian rebels.

As my colleagues know, in order to make a law, you need the Senate to pass something and the House to pass something or vice versa. Then, of course, it is signed by the President. They have to be identical. If we wish to prevent a government shutdown, we have to pass this continuing resolution the House will send us. I have had conversations with the Speaker, and he has been very strong in stating what they are going to do over there.

Senate committees are in the process—one of the committees the Senator from Tennessee is the ranking member of—in the process of holding hearings on whether an authorization to use force is necessary and if so, how it should be crafted. So I look forward to Foreign Relations deciding what legislative action to take on this matter. But in the meantime, we should pass the House-passed continuing resolution which includes the language on training and equipping the Syrian opposition and present the people here an up-or-down vote on what we get from the House of Representatives.

We cannot have another government shutdown. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I want to thank the leader for coming down and thank him for agreeing to a time when we both can be here.

I do want to say that we could deal with it exactly in the way that I laid out and keep the government from shutting down because we would be passing exactly the same language.

But I understand. I talked privately with the majority leader about this. I understand people do not want to do that over in this body. They do not want to separate the two. I know that the majority leader—that is his right, to object to dealing with these issues in the same language that I laid out. I

do appreciate him coming down. I disagree very strongly with this approach. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I believe under the regular order that I will be recognized for up to 30 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized.

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

ISIL THREAT

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, with all the things that are going on right now, I am particularly interested in the hearing we had yesterday on ISIS. It was a big deal. I applaud General Dempsey for his honesty in talking about how serious this war is that we are embarking on right now. The fact is that we have a mess, and ISIS has tripled in the last 3 months, up to now well over 30,000 troops, with tanks, heavy artillery.

This is not—I know the President has tried to make people believe this is just another rag-tag terrorist operation like Al Qaeda or the Taliban. It is not. This is war. This is a real serious thing that we are in the middle of.

I do applaud General Dempsey and also Secretary Hagel for their honesty in the committee hearing. It was difficult for them when the President talks about no troops on the ground, no troops on the ground. We know we already have troops on the ground.

I think the American people have had a wake-up call. I believe they understand how serious it is. In fact, there were two polls out last week. One of them was a poll that 70 percent of the American people know how serious this is and that ISIS could affect and would affect and is affecting our homeland. That was a big thing, that 70 percent of the people in America understand that. Just yesterday the Wall Street Journal poll came out, along with ABC, and they said the same thing: 70 percent of the people know this is something that affects our homeland.

When they talk about troops on the ground—I remember asking the question during the hearing yesterday. I said to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Martin Dempsey: If the President said no troops on the ground, what if your airstrikes—if something happens to one of those planes and we have the problem that one of the pilots is bailing out. Are you saying that we do not have troops on the ground to ensure his or her safety?

He said: Absolutely we will.

So the point is that has been a question that people have to understand, that this is war. We have to win it. We can't take another chance.

THE ECONOMY AND OVERREGULATION

But that is not why I am here. I think because of the distraction of ISIS and all of these other things, a lot of people have forgotten the serious problems that are hampering our economy; that is, what this President has done through the overregulation that takes

place. Since he first took office and failed to achieve his signature cap-and-trade legislation, he has been working tirelessly to try to do what he couldn't do through legislation with regulation. The regulations received most of the attention because they are the most expensive.

I first started in 2003, and I remember so much in the Senate. In 2003, at that time Republicans had a majority. I was the chair of the committee that had the jurisdiction. They started off in 2003 with the first cap-and-trade legislation, and we defeated it. We defeated it ever since that time. One reason we defeated it was I was able to find out—and I didn't know this in the beginning—that people said: Global warming is real, there are all these bad things, and we are all going to die.

Yet from the costs we determined—and this came not just from me but from others who were interested, but universities such as MIT came out with a study, the Wharton School of Economics came out with one, and Charles River Associates. They all had the cost of this cap-and-trade somewhere between \$300 billion and \$400 billion a year.

Every time I hear a large figure, I look at the population in my State of Oklahoma and see what that cost means to a family. In my State of Oklahoma, \$300 billion to \$400 billion a year would be a permanent tax increase for the average family in Oklahoma—that files a Federal income tax—of \$3,000 a year.

When we get to these numbers, we look and we realize this is going to be very expensive and no one wants anything to do with greenhouse regulations when the cost is so high.

I will show later on that it wouldn't accomplish anything, anyway. That is probably why the recent polls, such as the Gallup poll on global warming, have it on the bottom of the national priority list. Their last poll is a poll of 15 things to be most concerned about, and global warming and climate change registered No. 14 out of 15.

The people have understood—it is as if they understand now what is going on with ISIS. They know what the truth is.

The Pew Research Center showed that 53 percent of Americans either don't believe that global warming and climate change are occurring or they say if it is, it is natural causes.

This has been going on. This is what has bothered me. I can remember—and I am going from memory now—but I used to use the example, back when we first started looking at this subject, as to how this is a cyclone that has been going on for recorded history.

In 1895, we were in a cooling period, basically. They were referring to it as the little ice age at that time—I could be wrong. But, anyway, that endured until 1918. Then in 1918, it turned into a warming time and that went all the way up through 1945.

This is what is significant. In 1945, we started another cooling period. It hap-

pened that 1945 was the year that was recorded as the year when it had the highest amount of CO₂ emissions, and that precipitated not a warming period but a cooling period. Of course, that went on up to about 1975 when we went to the other side, where we have actually entered into a cooling area. Everybody knows that.

God is still up there. We have always had these seasons. People would like to think somehow it is man who is doing it. They don't want any progress. They don't want people to be able to generate electricity and energy to take care of our needs.

While my friends on the other side of the aisle act as though public debate has been settled on the issue, obviously it is just the opposite of that. It probably explains why it has been difficult for Tom Steyer to raise the full \$100 million he promised to help Democrats win elections this fall.

We remember in February that he announced he would put up \$50 million of his own money—and then he did—and that he would raise another \$50 million. It would be \$100 million that he would put in campaigns for incumbents who would agree to try to resurrect the global warming issue—because it has died in the eyes of the American people—and try to stop the pipeline.

He did this, and the trouble is he is not able to raise the other \$50 million. The last count was it is only \$1.7 million he has been able to raise from outside donors. Nonetheless, of course, he has his own \$50 million. Regardless, we know he is spending the money he has, even though he hasn't raised other money.

We can see on this chart a quote where he said—that is a picture of Tom Steyer. He is not a bad guy and all of that, he is just far left, and he has a lot of money. He said:

It is true that we expect to be heavily involved in the midterm elections. . . . we are looking at a bunch of . . . races. . . . My guess is that we'll end up being involved in eight or more races.

So Tom Steyer's goal is, as I said, to try to resurrect the global warming issue and try to stop the Keystone Pipeline.

I think it is an appropriate time to talk about the hypocrisy on the left over political spending. We spent all of last week debating a constitutional amendment to limit political speech that is currently protected under the First Amendment. Democrats are talking about the Koch brothers, and people are not aware that this type of activity was from a man named Tom Steyer, by his own admission.

Someone asked me the other day—I think we were on the floor. I was the only Republican to come down. It was kind of fun. They were having their all-night session. I made the statement: If there is anyone with insomnia at home who is not asleep yet, this is a good way to do it. I made the comment that this is something we know is going on.

I stated that with all these races that are out there, they are trying to do

something in order to elect people to try to go back to what they failed to be able to get. I think it is an appropriate time to get through that hypocrisy.

Recent news reports have surfaced and described the Democracy Alliance. That is an organization that aims to organize the policy objectives and funding streams of the leftwing liberal establishment.

According to an internal memo that was leaked to the press a few weeks ago, the Democracy Alliance for the past 9 years "has aligned donors, leaders in the progressive movement, [that is liberal] and political infrastructure in order to achieve victories at the ballot box and in policy fights including those for comprehensive health care reform, Supreme Court confirmations"

This influence is estimated to be between \$600 million and \$700 million.

The Washington Post recently had this chart. It is kind of hard to read, but in the Post it was obvious because each one of those dots is a liberal political organization. They all joined together and that is called the Democracy Alliance.

Again, this was 161 plus 21—182 organizations are part of this alliance. It details all of their agendas and how they are being coordinated by the political Democratic agenda by the Democracy Alliance. We will recognize most of the names on the list. It includes the Center for American Progress, Media Matters for America, America Votes, and even Organizing for Action which, incidentally, is President Obama's political campaign arm.

In April, this group convened a secret meeting in Chicago to huddle with its deep-pocketed donors to craft a strategy in messaging for this coming year's elections. It was shrouded in secrecy, and the memo prepared for attendees—all the people on this list who were coming in to meet in Chicago—warned them of interacting with political reporters. In fact, it included a pages-long list of reporters who are expected to try to crash the conference, along with the photos, so folks could be on the watch for these people.

The names of the people attending and involved were not going to be disclosed to the public, nor would any details be released about the discussions that were taking place.

Tom Steyer and the Democracy Alliance are acting like a cult, even as the Democratic left pushes for the institution of a new constitutional amendment. We now know that initiative was nothing more than a political sham.

At the end of the day, the liberal left wants an aggressive, secretive, political machine operating on its behalf, and it looks as though they have what they need in the Democracy Alliance.

The key selling point for the Democracy Alliance pitch to its contributors is the inseparable link to the deep connections with the Obama White House administration. The Democracy Alliance firmly believes it is in the driver's

seat when it comes to setting policy for liberals in Washington, and it wants its donors to know it.

There is nothing wrong with this. We have had differences of opinion and philosophy, and that is why we have political parties. This is more extreme than anything I have seen and more organized.

One of the key goals of the Democracy Alliance is to promote “an environment that keeps our kids safe.” This explains why the administration continues to push an extremist agenda of environmental mandates that will crush our economy.

This is where Tom Steyer has really succeeded in being part of the Democracy Alliance. He has managed to convince Democrats in the Senate to hold more than one all-night vigil on global warming, and these have come as the United States has been enduring one of its coldest years yet.

Just this month so far, NOAA, of the Commerce Department, has reported 246 record cold temperatures. Wyoming already has right now 20 inches of snow in some places, and it is unseasonably cold in Washington, DC.

One of these colder areas, my city of Tulsa, OK, on Saturday set a record cool high temperature. It only reached 65 degrees. It has never happened before, so it is not cooperating very well with trying to convince people the world is coming to an end because of global warming.

It also explains why the President is continuing to aggressively try to implement greenhouse regulations after failing to accomplish this goal legislatively. These regulations will effectively prevent any coal-fired powerplant from being constructed and force our Nation into relying substantially on expensive renewable resources.

Regulations such as these would take us in the direction of Europe, which in many instances has experienced electricity prices three times as high as they are in the United States. They have been ahead of us in trying to stop fossil fuels and in trying to stop nuclear energy. The rates their people are paying are now three times higher than ours.

If anyone doubts these rules will have a negative impact on our economy, just look at Australia. Australia imposed a carbon tax on their economy a few years ago and it caused horrendous damage. It caused \$9 billion in lost economic activity per year and destroyed tens of thousands of jobs. This is in Australia. This just happened. It was so bad that the government in Australia recently voted to repeal the carbon tax. Remember all the talk about the fact: Oh, Australians are leading the way and they are going to have a carbon tax, we should be following them. Now they have repealed that by an overwhelming vote and their economy is now better for it. In fact, it was announced last week that Australia experienced record job growth last month of 121,000 jobs. They said this is because

they have repealed this carbon tax they had passed. They credit this success to the repeal of the carbon tax in addition to these greenhouse regulations.

I think it is important for us to recall the many other regulations this Obama administration has already imposed on the American people and discuss all of the new regulations that have not yet come out, but they are working on it. Some of these regulations they are holding off until after the elections so the people would not know the cost of the regulations and how many jobs are going to be lost.

The first we need to remember is Utility MACT. By the way, MACT means maximum achievable controlled technology. In other words, what technology has told us we could do to try to control these releases.

Utility MACT was the first one they successfully passed. In this case, the EPA established a standard that was impossible for utilities to actually meet.

This regulation is inappropriate under the Clean Air Act, and it is having a \$100 billion annual impact on the economy and destroying 1.65 million jobs. They have already done it. They were able to pass it along party lines.

The EPA has already finalized similar regulations for industrial boilers and cement kilns. Together, those regulations are having an impact of more than \$63 billion on the economy and they have destroyed 800,000 jobs and may result in the shutdown of 18 cement plants around the country. No one has refuted these figures.

In another section of the law, the EPA put a rule together, knowing it would increase the cost of gas. The rule is known as the Tier 3 rule, and it regulates the amount of sulfur that can be in gasoline when it leaves the refinery.

Tier 2 standards were put in place back in the early 2000s. That resulted in a 90-percent decline in the sulfur content of gasoline by 2010. That is already behind us, and it had a positive, measurable impact on the environment.

The need for a Tier 3 standard is not articulated very well. In fact, EPA did not have any unique scientific data to support the key benefits of this rule, and the EPA ignored the fact that it would actually increase greenhouse gas emissions. So they are going to increase greenhouse gas emissions with the rule they are still putting forth and be counterproductive. Talking about the Tier 3 rule, EPA stated that “this rule will increase the cost of gasoline.”

Furthermore, the EPA recently finalized a rule called the 316(b) water rule. This rule regulates the cooling water systems used by powerplants and other major industrial facilities to prevent their operations from overheating. So they use water. The EPA and the Fish and Wildlife Service were worried about the impact these facilities were having on fish, and so they put out a rule to help. In the rulemaking, EPA

again states that “the final rule will increase electricity costs.”

Worse is the fact that EPA could not even fudge its numbers enough to present a positive cost-benefit ratio. In its final rule, the stated costs are \$300 million, which is about 10 times the estimated benefits of the rule, which are only \$28.6 million. This violates the President's own Executive Order 13563, which states that agencies must “propose or adopt a regulation only upon a reasoned determination that its benefits justify its costs.”

That is another problem we have with this administration. They will add rules, they will add laws, and they violate these laws—just like when he turned loose the five terrorists from Gitmo. We had passed, in fact, knowing he was going to try to get rid of people in Gitmo—and he took the five who were the very worst—we had passed a law saying he can't do that until he gives the Senate Armed Services Committee 30 days' notice and gives us a chance to respond and stop him from doing it. He totally ignored it, just as he ignored these regulations.

Worse yet, this rule has no human health benefits. Its only beneficiaries are fish. So EPA is putting out a rule that will increase electricity costs, including for those who live on fixed incomes, all for the sake of saving a few fish.

Another rule EPA has done since President Obama began his administration is the regional haze rule. These regulations were established to improve the visibility of national parks, and States were instructed to develop their own plans—known as State implementation plans—in order to comply. My State of Oklahoma did this, but EPA overturned it because of a technicality associated with its economic analysis. When EPA did this, it instituted a Federal implementation plan, and in this case it cost over \$1 billion to execute or nearly 10 times the amount of the State-based plan that had been developed cooperatively with our utility companies. This is the kind of uncooperative relationship we have come to expect when working with the EPA.

Beyond the greenhouse gas regulations, the one receiving the most attention is the waters of the United States rule. Nearly every group from Oklahoma is talking about this rule because it would extend the powers of the Federal Government over millions of new acres of land.

Just last week I was in Guymon, OK; El Reno, OK; and Boise City, OK. Boise City is the farthest west, largest city out in the panhandle. It is kind of sandwiched between Oklahoma, New Mexico, Kansas, and Texas. They are all in western Oklahoma. This is an arid part of the country. They are in their third year of their drought right now, but the new rule would declare much of this area as a Federal waterway subject to the onerous Federal regulations. This would impact every industry—farming, ranching, oil and gas,

construction, transportation—everything.

Tom Buchanan happens to be the president of the Oklahoma Farm Bureau. I asked him a question in a kind of townhall setting that we had not too long ago.

I said: What is the biggest problem we have in agriculture in Oklahoma?

He said: The biggest problem has nothing to do with the farm bill. The biggest problem we are facing right now is the overregulation by the EPA and what they are doing with endangered species, what they are doing with the containment of fuel on farms, what they are doing with the water rules they have. That is the biggest problem.

I was with Terry Detrick, president of the American Farmers and Ranchers, and he agrees that the biggest problem farmers in America are having right now is the overregulation of the EPA.

The EPA has said it will work with industries to make sure it works for them, but we know from experience this won't be possible. It is not going to happen. Their goal is to take over, to control and leave no room for negotiation.

Another devastating regulation being developed by the EPA is the ozone NAAQS standard. NAAQS means national ambient air quality standard. It was last set at the end of the Bush administration at 75 parts per billion. The EPA has been working since President Obama took over the White House to lower this standard.

In 2011 the President cancelled EPA's plans to lower the ozone standard because it was going to hurt his reelection chances. But now that he has secured that reelection, he is ready to start it up again.

The EPA staff and the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee—CASAC—recently recommended that the Administrator propose to lower the NAAQS level to between 60 and 70 parts per billion.

This chart shows how much of the Nation would be out of attainment if EPA lowers the standard to 60 parts per billion. In Oklahoma, all 77 counties would be out of attainment. What does that mean? I was mayor of the city of Tulsa once when it was out of attainment. We were not able to increase populations in many of our businesses.

It essentially means the EPA will have to issue a regulatory permit for any business expansion plans that could increase emission levels. It would make business expansion enormously expensive and would dramatically increase the power of the EPA. All told, this rule would put nearly 94 percent of the counties' populations of the United States of America out of attainment zones and would cede our economic superiority to the likes of China and India.

Zooming in to more industry-focused regulations, the EPA has been the main culprit in the President's war on fossil fuels. Hydraulic fracturing and

horizontal drilling have opened up dramatic new oil and natural gas resources in this country that no one thought we would ever be able to profitably extract.

By the way, hydraulic fracturing was actually developed in my State of Oklahoma, in Duncan, OK, in 1949. So this is something that is going on. In spite of this, they are trying to use hydraulic fracturing to stop the successful increases we have been able to have in the wells.

Lisa Jackson was the first EPA Administrator under Barack Obama. I remember asking her the question: If we were to do something with hydraulic fracturing, has there ever been a documented case in the United States that hydraulic fracturing is damaging to groundwater?

She said: No, it is not. There has never been—her actual exact words—any proven case where the fracking process itself has affected water.

So if we eliminate this, it is not going to save anything because it is not going to create any problems. And this doesn't come from me; it comes from the Administrator of the EPA, appointed by President Obama. Regardless, the EPA is moving full force to regulate hydraulic fracturing. At one point during the administration, there were a total of 13 different agencies working to do this. The Bureau of Land Management is one of them. It is my understanding that their regulations are being finalized, and it could cost producers as much as \$100,000 per well. Keep in mind that every time they talk about what it is going to cost industry or business, that is passed on to the public.

The EPA is also working to regulate methane emissions from across the oil and natural gas industry. Whether it is the upstream producers during the drilling and completion process, the midstream pipeline operators, or the downstream retail distributors, EPA is convinced that the industry is willingly allowing their valuable product to seep into the atmosphere without any concern or awareness of where it is.

EPA's methane strategy is part of the President's overall climate change action plan, and the Agency recently published white papers outlining its understanding of methane leaks in the industry, and they were not very impressive.

I recently wrote EPA and the White House to express my concern with these papers. I was shocked that the papers seemed to lack any comprehensive understanding of the industry's operational practices. I was also disappointed that EPA didn't consider many of the regulatory hurdles in place which actually prevent producers from installing the technology and infrastructure that would reduce methane emissions. I am hopeful that EPA will take my recommendations seriously before moving forward.

So we have two problems. Right now we could be totally independent of any

other country. All we have to do is do what every other country in the world does; that is, exploit our own resources. This President has made it impossible for us to get into public lands and to get this done.

Then, of course, we have the problem of overregulation. In all, the administration's regulatory agenda is intended to shut down the engine of America's economy. They have already shut down coal. Now they are working on oil and natural gas.

What they have done so far is just a preview. But the liberal environmentalists—Tom Steyer, Bill McKibben, Democracy Alliance—must all be frustrated by what is going on right now. Temperatures are not going up, they are going down. Nobody seems to care. No one has any desire to implement the policies they want. Polling is all showing they have lost this battle. That is exactly why they are willing to spend between \$600 million and \$700 million on this year's elections—to convince the American people to elect Members who will support the President's regulations, which will shut down the economy.

One more thing, going back to global warming. Earlier I said that back in 2002 when we discussed the costs of it, being between \$300 billion and \$400 billion, as the largest tax increase in history, a permanent tax increase, I asked the question to Lisa Jackson—again, she was the Administrator of the EPA, appointed by Barack Obama—I said: If we were to pass these cap-and-trade regulations or bills or do it by regulation, would this have the result of lowering CO₂ emissions?

She said: No, because this isn't where the problem is. The problem is in China, it is in India, it is in Mexico, it is in other places.

In fact, one could use the argument that it would actually have the effect of increasing emissions because as we chase away our base, the manufacturing base will go to countries like China and India, where they don't have any restrictions on emissions at all.

I think it is important to remind the people that even though that era is almost gone and people realize that is something that was very popular at one time, now the polls show that people have caught on. But keep in mind that what the President could not do through legislation he is now doing through regulations, and regulations, as we pointed out, are the greatest problem our economy is facing today, and this is something we are going to have to change.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington State.

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank and the legislation that we are soon going to be seeing on a continuing resolution that was just voted on by the House of

Representatives. While I am happy that there is a CR—a continuing resolution—that keeps our government open, I am very distressed with the fact that the House is sending us a simple 9-month extension of the Export-Import Bank to expire June 30 of next year.

The reason why that is so frustrating to me and many of my colleagues over here is because this is a jobs issue. It is about our economy, and we have heard today at various venues throughout the Capitol how people are actually losing jobs right now because of the uncertainty of the Export-Import Bank. So I know that some of my colleagues in the House of Representatives—Republicans—are proud they have helped to reauthorize the bank for 9 months. Make no mistake about it; this will cost us jobs in the United States of America during that time period.

We had a press conference today. I was proud to be joined by my colleagues Senator KIRK, Senator GRAHAM, Senator MANCHIN, and various leaders in the energy industry—the Nuclear Energy Institute; Combustion Associates, Inc.; Itron, which is a company in the Northwest; Westinghouse; and FirmGreen—to talk about how many energy jobs are dependent upon the Export-Import Bank. You can see from this chart: 46,000 U.S. energy jobs and \$7.7 billion in energy exports.

Just last year these transactions helped these energy jobs in the United States of America by putting investments in projects overseas. That is why we want to see a long-term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. While this uncertainty exists in the continuing resolution, all you are going to do is to exclude U.S. companies from closing deals. That is because a credit agency is critical to U.S. companies actually being at the table.

We heard from one firm today, FirmGreen, that they were actually excluded from participating and getting a deal simply because of the uncertainty of the Ex-Im Bank: A credit agency guaranteeing financing the deal was not at the table and we lost out to an Asian competitor. So during these 9 months of uncertainty, that is exactly what is going to happen to more U.S. companies. They are going to lose out on these energy jobs that we are looking for overseas.

I am talking about things that are part of our energy strategy—everything from Sub-Saharan Africa, wind turbines in Central America, and powerplants in Africa to various investments in the nuclear facilities. A short-term 9-month extension doesn't provide a large enough window for companies to build a pipeline, to construct a wind turbine or to develop a nuclear facility. So it will hurt us by slowing down on these energy projects just at a time when we are trying to fund the training of troops to combat ISIS. We are going to be creating uncertainty in places such as Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Iraq on water projects, construction projects, and road

projects that might not get done because U.S. companies won't be able to get the financing of a credit agency. So this is a national security issue, and we are already hearing from exporters about this.

Mr. President, I would like to submit for the RECORD a list of 30 different newspapers with editorials supporting the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

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

NEWSPAPERS ENDORSING EX-IM
REAUTHORIZATION

1. New York Times
2. USA Today
3. Los Angeles Times
4. Chicago Tribune
5. Boston Globe
6. Miami Herald
7. Houston Chronicle
8. Seattle Times
9. Columbus Dispatch
10. Akron Beacon-Journal
11. Milwaukee Journal-Constitution
12. Wichita Eagle
13. Winfield Daily Courier (KS)
14. The Hartford Courant
15. The Fort Myers News-Press (FL)
16. Crain's Detroit Business
17. Scranton Times-Tribune
18. Lancaster Intelligencer Journal (PA)
19. Rock Hill Herald (SC)
20. Greenville News (SC)
21. Orangeburg Times and Democrat (SC)
22. Beaumont Enterprise (TX)
23. San Antonio Express-News (TX)
24. Roanoke Times
25. The Columbian (WA)
26. Tacoma News Tribune
27. The Spokesman-Review
28. The Olympian
29. The Puget Sound Business Journal
30. Bellingham Herald

Ms. CANTWELL. The Roanoke Times was one of those newspapers. It typifies what companies are saying, that "to really increase manufacturing jobs, you need to increase exports."

That is why we feel so strongly about this. The Roanoke Times also said:

It's a global economy. Policymakers need to put U.S. manufacturers on an even playing field with foreign competitors in emerging markets, not take them out of the game.

That is exactly what happens when we give a short-term reauthorization for 9 months. No deal of this size and magnitude with energy companies gets done in a 9-month period of time. It takes the bank basically 3 months just for the processing. The discussion of being at the table, closing the deal, and competing with your competitors takes much longer, and no one is going to be interested in closing a deal when they don't know whether the bank is going to continue to exist.

That is why other newspapers such as the Times-Picayune has said that one of their companies—basically a CEO of Reliable Industries of New Orleans—said: "The Export-Import Bank is a major reason his firm has built an export business with 600 customers in 60 countries."

I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and the other side of the Capitol who don't understand busi-

ness: The notion that you don't get is that the export opportunities for our economy are the biggest chances to grow GDP in America, and you are foreclosing on that for the next 9 months because you are creating uncertainty and unpredictability.

Well, you know what I say to that? You are basically shipping jobs overseas. That is exactly what you are doing. You are participating in shipping jobs overseas because you don't want to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out that the United States right now in manufacturing has a supply chain of small businesses all throughout the United States that help in the farm economy in building farm equipment, help in the aerospace industry building airplanes and airplane-related products, and in the energy economy, as we focused on today at our press conference. All of these suppliers, when they cannot get financing for their products, are going to look to overseas suppliers who can get support from the credit agencies in their country, whether that is China, whether that is in France or whether its in Germany or other countries. So people who don't support giving predictability on the Export-Import Bank are supporting shipping jobs overseas.

Our economy is struggling too much and our national security interests are at stake to be shipping jobs overseas and not having the investments in these countries such as Iraq and Egypt and other places where we want to build security. I believe in the long-term interest of fighting our challenges with extremism around the globe with economic power. I know people are going to talk about military power and people are going to talk about soft power. I believe in economic power. Having an Export-Import Bank that is doing business like building roads and building water and building energy facilities actually helps to stabilize these areas of the world.

I am glad to see that General Petraeus also agrees. General Petraeus basically said that the Ex-Im Bank "is integral to our country's security interests." Integral—he has watched this on the ground and he knows and understands what the Export-Import Bank is, and he is asking us to give it more certainty and predictability than what a 9-month extension does, because, as I said, business deals cannot get done in that short a period of time. Here is a person who understands these issues both from a military perspective and an economic perspective. I wish more of my colleagues would understand that they are basically just shipping jobs overseas.

Newspapers around the country are continuing to try to help echo this issue. The Charlotte Business Journal said: "Executives say the Ex-Im Bank is a key to a competitive U.S. nuclear industry." They have been trying to focus on this issue.

The Boston Globe said: "Billions will be lost unless Congress reauthorizes

the Export-Import Bank." It also went on to call exactly what this game is that is happening right here and now in Washington, DC. The Boston Globe in their editorial in support of a longer reauthorization said: "Conservative hardliners rallying to shut down the agency are risking a serious, self-inflicted economic wound."

That is because we don't have to be at this point. If you want to talk about reforms for the Ex-Im Bank, we have a lot of opportunity to do that, but hardliners don't want to reauthorize the bank.

Having been in business, I am somebody who believes in trend lines. I would ask my colleagues who are going home and thinking they are going to campaign about jobs to ask themselves what kind of message are they sending to the global community about the Export-Import Bank when just a few years ago an agency that should have a 5-year reauthorization was only reauthorized for 2 years—just 2 years. Now you are going to go into the international community and say, wait a minute, we only believe in this bank for 9 months. So the trend line is it used to be 5 years. For basically about 80 years it used to be 5 years, but because the conservative tea party people are having their way—not the majority of the people in the House but the tea party conservatives are having their way—this has gone from a 5-year reauthorization to a 2-year reauthorization to now a 9-month reauthorization. Who knows what they will propose next. We know they don't support the bank. We know they want to get rid of it.

I think the Charlotte Business Journal, again, characterized this issue very well because they know this industry: "The United States will lose its lead in nuclear technology if it is not involved in the construction boom overseas."

You are not going to be very involved in the construction boom over the next 9 months because you are not going to be able to get people to close long-term deals when they think the other side of the aisle just wants to kill the Export-Import Bank.

I think the Columbian in my State said it best. They said: "While complaining about the Ex-Im Bank might make for sound bites that pander to conservatives, in the end it amounts to legislative negligence."

They are talking in general about those who want to kill the Export-Import Bank, but the very day that the House proposed a 9-month extension, the Republican study group also proposed killing the Export-Import Bank. So make no mistake about it, there are those who are pandering to very conservative views who basically just want to end the Export-Import Bank.

Thank God we have other businesses in this country. The Louisville Courier-Journal said: "When a small company is attempting to navigate the international marketplace, it can be difficult to manage the risks related to fi-

nancing and growth and securing payment."

That is a local company in Louisville, KY, that knows what it takes to compete in an international marketplace. That industry leader also said that the Ex-Im Bank has helped them manage the risk and as a result their export business has grown strong in recent years. That is what is at stake for these small businesses and supply chains to getting this business done.

I think for us right now the challenge is to try to get people to understand that a 9-month extension is not going to solve this problem. It is going to exacerbate the lack of confidence in our ability to get this bank reauthorized for a long period of time.

The Wichita Eagle editorial also added a this great comment: "Failure of Congress to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank would be a philosophical victory for some—but a badly timed blow to Kansas companies trying to compete in the global marketplace." They went on to say to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

So, while I know the House is sending us 9 months, and I know that some people are trying to take comfort that they have dodged this issue instead of taking a really hard vote on it or improving the bank, all they have done is left the marketplace with a great deal of uncertainty.

It will cost us jobs; it will shift jobs overseas, and Congress—here in the Senate we need to act to get a long-term reauthorization for the Ex-Im Bank.

The Wichita paper had it right. Reauthorize this bank—not a short-term Band-Aid, but give the certainty that businesses need to compete in the global economy and help our economy at home by growing jobs.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, over the last hour or so I had the good fortune to hear the junior Senator from Washington, Ms. CANTWELL, describe what is happening with the Ex-Im Bank, and it is not good for the country.

The Ex-Im Bank is so very important to the Presiding Officer's State. The State of Connecticut benefits tremendously from the Ex-Im Bank, as do the small manufacturing businesses in the State of Nevada.

As Senator CANTWELL said, it is a shame we are shipping more jobs overseas, and by not extending the Ex-Im Bank long term, that is what we are doing. She is such an advocate for this program which is so important to our country. I underline and underscore everything she said this afternoon. I am

so disappointed we are not able to have a long-term extension of the Ex-Im Bank. It is very important, and it is too bad we are not going to do that.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.J. RES. 124

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.J. Res. 124, which was received from the House and is at the desk, at 1 p.m. on Thursday, September 18; that following the reporting of the joint resolution, the majority leader be recognized; that there be up to 4½ hours equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, there be no other motions or points of order in order to the joint resolution other than a Sessions or designee motion to table or a budget point of order and the applicable motion to waive; that Senator SESSIONS or designee be recognized for a motion to table an amendment to the joint resolution; that if the motion to table is agreed to, the majority leader be recognized; that if the motion to table is not agreed to, and notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on H.J. Res. 124; that if cloture is invoked, all postcloture time be considered expired, the pending amendments be withdrawn, the joint resolution be read a third time, and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the joint resolution.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ADVANCING WOMEN'S RIGHTS

Mr. LEAHY. Next year, the Nation will celebrate the 95th anniversary of the ratification of the 19th Amendment, which gave women, at long last, the right to vote. The result of more than four decades of advocacy from such giants of the women's equality movement as Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, the amendment was merely a first step in advancing women's rights.

Since the ratification of the 19th Amendment, there has been considerable progress in the march for gender equality. The President's Commission on the Status of Women, established by President Kennedy and directed by First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt, in part led to formation of the National Organization for Women. NOW's core issues include two on which this Congress has been rightly focused: ending violence against women, and promoting economic justice.

The country last week celebrated the 20th anniversary of the enactment of