

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for the next 10 minutes.

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

Ms. CANTWELL. I have enjoyed listening to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about Senator TOOMEY's amendment and all about subsidies. Well, it is hard to argue about subsidies when we are talking about the Ex-Im Bank generating \$3.7 billion for U.S. taxpayers since 2005.

So if this is a subsidy, we need a lot more of it because you are winning in producing jobs and you are actually producing money for the Treasury. This is a very important tool for us to win in a global economy. I think my colleague from South Carolina who spoke earlier said it best when he talked about the manufacturing jobs that are now in that State and what an important tool it is.

I am not one of those who basically says: Oh, we should do it because other countries do it. I am saying, you should recognize that is going on, but that the United States needs to understand there is a global marketplace for its products. If you believe in U.S. manufacturers, as I do—and I have seen them in my State—they are winning the day in producing products and services that can beat the competition in international marketplaces. They can.

I have seen grain silos, I have seen music stands, and, yes, I have seen airplanes. So the question is, are we going to let U.S. products that can beat the competition in an international marketplace lose because the purchaser of those products is looking for financing mechanisms that will help them secure financing and purchase of those products? That is the question.

Does the United States want to do those kinds of activities? I say we should be even more aggressive. Why? Because the global development of many countries that are now buying U.S. products is going to continue to grow. In my State, in southwest Washington, in Vancouver, I saw the second largest grain elevator in the entire world—the second largest grain elevator. I said: Why do we have the second largest grain elevator in the entire world right here at the Port of Vancouver? They said to me: Because as the Asian middle class rises, they want to eat beef. And if they want to eat beef, they have to have grain.

What is wrong with the United States selling grain to Asian markets because they want our product—or all these other products we have been talking about today? These are examples of products in the United States where we are actually building a product that many countries and many end customers want. We should celebrate that, and we should realize, as the growing middle class around the globe increases, there is even more opportunity for the United States to sell products and win the day in the marketplace. So I do not know what they are talking

about when they say “subsidies,” because this has been good for the U.S. taxpayers, and it has been good for our economy.

Specifically to the Toomey amendment, this amendment would require unnecessary conditions for helping the bank in the future. Basically, it would put a hold on the financing of the Export-Import Bank until we negotiated on an international basis to terminate this kind of financing.

As I said, for many States, they have had great benefits. In Pennsylvania, they have had the economic benefit—this is in just 2011—of \$1.4 billion in exports and over 9,000 jobs. So here is something that has actually created jobs, created money for the U.S. economy—basically money back to U.S. taxpayers that we have used to help pay down the deficit. So how is it that is bad for us? In the meantime, that manufacturer in Pennsylvania is winning and getting his product out on an international basis and, hopefully, expanding his business to many different countries.

We had numbers on some of the other examples of companies that have been helped in various States. These are products and services like many in my State. We have visited a grain silo producer in Spokane, WA, that is winning in selling its product. We visited a music stands company, Manhasset Music Stands. You would think somebody might be able to compete with them and beat them in the international marketplace, but, in fact, they are winning the day in the international marketplace, and the Export-Import Bank helps them in doing so.

There are many examples of how this particular program is a win for taxpayers, is a win for manufacturers, and is a win for the U.S. economy. These amendments that are all trying to gut the Export-Import Bank would send this back to the House, when we need to be sending it to the President's desk, giving certainty and predictability to our economy, giving certainty and predictability to a program that has existed for decades, for which often there has been a voice vote—instead of holding it up, actually making sure manufacturers have the opportunity and know where the financing is.

I yield the floor.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:40 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. WEBB).

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—MOTIONS TO PROCEED

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks on Wednesday, May 16, the Senate proceed to the consideration of motions to proceed to the following budget resolutions listed, en bloc: Calendar No. 357, S. Con. Res. 41; Calendar No. 354, H. Con. Res. 112; Calendar No. 356, S. Con. Res. 37; Calendar No. 384, S. Con. Res. 42; and Calendar No. 395, S. Con. Res. 44; that there be 6 hours of debate on the motions to proceed equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on the five motions to proceed in the order listed above; that there be 2 minutes equally divided between the votes and that all after the first vote be 10-minute votes; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that notwithstanding the adoption of any motion to proceed, the Senate proceed to the remaining votes on motions to proceed; further, that at the conclusion of those votes, the Senate resume consideration of the budget resolution if a motion to proceed is adopted; and that if no motion to proceed has been adopted, the majority leader be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, there has not been a budget passed in the Senate and the House in over 3 years. I would argue that the exercise we have ending tomorrow will have no substantial difference. I do not think there is anyone in America who believes we will have a budget at the end of tomorrow. The Congressional Budget Act of 1974 requires Congress to pass a budget by April 15. So with that, I ask unanimous consent that the request of the leader be modified so that S. 981, the No Budget, No Pay Act, be automatically discharged from the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee, the bill be immediately placed on the calendar, and that when the Senate proceeds to the budget votes mentioned in the Senator's request, the Senate also vote on the motion to proceed to S. 981 under the same terms and conditions of the other budget votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. CONRAD. Objection has been heard on our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection to the modification. Is there objection to the original request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, just on the note that the Senator raised, I want to make clear that I have heard over and over: No budget resolution has passed in 1,000 days. What is not being said is that instead of a budget

resolution last year, the Senate and the House passed the Budget Control Act. The Budget Control Act is not a resolution, it is a law. A resolution, as all Members know, is purely a congressional document. It never goes to the President for his signature.

Last year, instead of a budget resolution, this body and the other body passed legislation called the Budget Control Act that set a budget, budget limits, and spending limits for this year and next. Actually, it went even further: It set 10 years of spending caps. A budget resolution usually only sets 1 year of spending caps.

So I wanted to make clear that instead of a budget resolution being passed last year, the House and the Senate passed the Budget Control Act to set spending limits for this year and next and for the 8 years beyond.

In addition, the Budget Control Act established a supercommittee and gave it special authority to reform the tax system and the entitlement system and said that if they could come to an agreement, they would not face a filibuster. With a simple majority, we could reform the tax system and the entitlement system here in the Senate. The Budget Control Act further said that if the special committee does not agree to reform the tax system, to reform the entitlement system, there will be an additional \$1.2 trillion of spending cuts put in place over and above the \$900 billion of cuts put in place by the Budget Control Act through spending caps for 10 years. That is a total—because the special committee did not agree—of over \$2 trillion of spending cuts that are now in law as a result of the Budget Control Act. That is the largest spending cut package in the history of the United States, and it is law. It is law because of the Budget Control Act passed last year.

Now, my colleagues can go and shout it through the rooftops, as they have done, that the Congress has not passed a budget resolution in 1,000 days, but they are not telling the whole story. They are not telling people that instead of a resolution, the House and the Senate passed a law. A law is stronger than any resolution. A resolution is purely a congressional document. A law has to be signed by the President of the United States.

The Budget Control Act was passed by the Senate on an overwhelming bipartisan vote, passed by the House, and signed by the President of the United States. It sets the budget limits for this year and next, and it goes beyond that. It sets 10 years of spending caps, saving \$900 billion. And because the special committee could not agree to reforming the tax system and the entitlement system, it put in place another \$1.2 trillion of spending cuts that are now in law. That is a total of over \$2 trillion of spending cuts.

What we do not have is the longer term plan the Budget Control Act hoped would come about as a result of

the work of the special committee. So that is work we still need to do, but nobody should be under any misimpression or misunderstanding that we do not have spending limits in place for this year and next and, in fact, for all discretionary spending, spending limits in place for the whole of the next 10 years. That is a fact.

Tomorrow we are going to have a chance to debate fundamental issues of where the resources of the United States go. But we are in a different situation than we normally would be because the Budget Control Act is in law. We know what the appropriators can spend for this year and next. That is locked in. And tomorrow we will have a chance to debate longer term plans.

I will be interested to see what some of our colleagues say about some of the truly extraordinary and extreme budget plans that are being offered by my colleagues on the other side—plans to eliminate Medicare in 2 years, plans to cut Social Security benefits by 39 percent, plans to have trillions of dollars of additional tax cuts for the wealthiest among us, and at the same time cut education 25 percent, cut funding to reduce our dependence on foreign energy by 60 percent, plans to cut spending beyond the Budget Control Act limitations by another \$2 trillion.

We are going to see, from some of my colleagues on the other side, truly extreme plans. I hope they will be voted down tomorrow. I hope we will be able to make clear to the American people with the Budget Control Act law that passed last year, instead of a budget resolution, there are spending caps in place this year and next and the 8 years beyond.

Tomorrow will be an interesting day to discuss different Members' views of the fiscal future of this country. Make no mistake, we need to come together on a long-term plan to get us back on track.

I was part of the Bowles-Simpson Commission. In fact, it was the idea of Senator Gregg and myself to have such a commission. I voted for the findings of that commission to save more than \$4 trillion. I was part of the Group of 6 who spent an entire year trying to find a way to implement Bowles-Simpson. So I am fully prepared to have this debate and this discussion.

I am eager for us to come together around a plan to get us back on track, but it is going to require all sides to get out of their fixed positions. That is probably unlikely right before an election, but it needs to happen before the end of this year. I am very hopeful that Bowles-Simpson—that fiscal commission plan—serves as a good example of where we might find common ground. Both sides, all sides, need to get out of their fixed positions to reach an agreement to get our country back on track.

I yield the floor.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2012—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, we yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2100.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 86, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 91 Leg.]

YEAS—12

Cornyn	Hatch	Paul
Crapo	Kyl	Risch
DeMint	Lee	Rubio
Grassley	McCain	Vitter

NAYS—86

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Alexander	Franken	Moran
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Barrasso	Graham	Murray
Baucus	Hagan	Nelson (NE)
Begich	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Heller	Portman
Bingaman	Hoeben	Pryor
Blumenthal	Hutchison	Reed
Blunt	Inhofe	Reid
Boozman	Inouye	Roberts
Boxer	Isakson	Sanders
Brown (MA)	Johanns	Schumer
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)	Sessions
Burr	Johnson (WI)	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kerry	Shelby
Cardin	Klobuchar	Snowe
Carper	Kohl	Stabenow
Casey	Landrieu	Tester
Chambliss	Lautenberg	Thune
Coats	Leahy	Toomey
Coburn	Levin	Udall (CO)
Cochran	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Collins	Lugar	Warner
Conrad	Manchin	Webb
Coons	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Corker	McConnell	Wicker
Durbin	Menendez	Wyden
Enzi	Merkley	

NOT VOTING—2

Kirk	Rockefeller
------	-------------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 2101

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 2101 to be offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. PAUL.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2101.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.