

we reauthorized the Bank. So I would ask the Senator from Utah: Why not move the confirmation of McWatters to the floor so my colleague can have a full-throated debate about the Bank? Why not have a full-throated debate instead of hiding that nomination in the Banking Committee and using that structure to thwart what in fact a majority of both bodies of the Congress and the President have done when they reauthorized the Bank?

Mr. LEE. I am grateful to respond to both points made by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from North Dakota.

In the first place, as to the need to have a full-throated debate, I welcome that. That is exactly what we need. It is what I have been wanting to have for a long time. But last year, instead of having a full-throated debate specifically about Ex-Im, we saw Ex-Im attached to a much larger package—a much larger package that a lot of people were determined to support, regardless of what else was in there. So a lot of people voted for that package, regardless of how they might feel about the Export-Import Bank. But as for a full-throated debate, yes, that is exactly what we need. We would get that if we could actually debate the reauthorization of Export-Import on its own merits, as we should have done last year. We were deprived of that opportunity, so now we are using every opportunity we can to have a real full-throated debate. That is why we are doing this. That is exactly the reason we need to do that.

As to the figure the Senator cited with respect to the percentage of loans going to small business, sure, if one wants to talk about the number of actual loans made, one can make that number look pretty good. But look at the number that I think is more significant: Only one-half of 1 percent of all small businesses in America actually benefit from Ex-Im financing. That is a pretty significant deal when one looks at how much of the lending authority in the total dollar amount the Export-Import Bank supplies to larger businesses and to businesses, regardless of their size, that could in fact obtain financing in the open market.

Again, we are not back in the Great Depression anymore. This is a Great Depression era relic. So regardless of what my colleague may think about the Great Depression era dynamics at play that caused those serving in this body and the House of Representatives in the 1930s to put this program in place, we have other challenges today. And many of those challenges are created by the government itself—by the government being too big a presence within our marketplace, inuring ultimately to the benefit of big business and harming everyone else.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I see other colleagues here ready to make presentations, but I just want to make two final points.

If my colleagues want a full-throated debate, then move the nomination onto

the floor and out of the committee. Let's have the debate. My colleagues are using the nomination to reemphasize and relitigate the Ex-Im Bank. Let's do it.

In the meantime, let's appreciate that, in spite of everything that is being said here, we need the Bank to be competitive. We need the Bank to make sure that we can, in fact, manufacture in this country. And that is something that gets lost in all the rhetoric.

I think one of the things we have an obligation to think about is all those jobs that are going to go someplace else and all those Americans who are going to stand in the line for unemployment benefits and who are going to get their pink slips. And who in the U.S. Senate wants to line up at the factory door as they are walking through the last time and shake their hand and say: You know, too bad you lost your job.

So I yield the floor, and I intend to have further debate about the Export-Import Bank.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I would note that Senator KLOBUCHAR is here and she, I believe, wanted to participate in the discussion about the IMF, but we shortly have a vote, and we would very much like to proceed. The majority leader is here also.

I am prepared to speak now on the pending Reed amendment that we are going to go to a vote on at 11:15.

Ms. MIKULSKI. We need to talk on the bill.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR addressed the Chair.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island has the floor.

Mr. REED. I yield the floor to the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE,
AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 120, H.R. 2578.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 120, H.R. 2578, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 120, H.R. 2578, an act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Richard C. Shelby, Richard Burr, Daniel Coats, Ben Sasse, Roger F. Wicker, Thom Tillis, Steve Daines, Chuck Grassley, Susan M. Collins, Thad Cochran, James Lankford, Lamar Alexander, John Hoeven, Roy Blunt.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield the floor.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 4549

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I would like to make some brief remarks with respect to the Reed amendment that is pending, before our vote. Senator MIKULSKI would like to also, and I note the chairman is here. But I ask unanimous consent that when I finish my brief remarks, Senator MIKULSKI be recognized.

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

Mr. REED. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, we have had a very extensive and very thoughtful debate about the underlying amendment by Senator MCCAIN to increase OCO spending by \$18 billion strictly for Department of Defense operations and functions, and those are very critical and very important.

There have been two principles we have followed over the last several years when it comes to trying to push back the effects of sequestration. Those principles have been that the security of the United States is significantly affected by the Department of Defense's operations, but not exclusively. Indeed, there are many functions outside the parameters of the Department of Defense that are absolutely critical and essential to the protection of the American people at home and abroad: the FBI, the Department of Homeland Security, the CDC. So that has been one of the principles. The other principle we recognize is that that in lifting these temporary limits, we have to do it on an equal basis.

What the amendment Senator MIKULSKI and I have offered does is embrace