

back to letting hard-working Americans who build a great product get the credit assurances they need to sell their products on a global basis and to win in the international marketplace. That is what America is all about. Don't hold these people down. They are the people who created, with great ingenuity and great sweat, the great products that have made our country great. So let them export their products. Don't make it harder for them just because you want to win a trophy from the Heritage Foundation.

Let's get back to making sure we are making this place operate. We know the majority both in the House and Senate supports the Export-Import Bank and the jobs it creates. Let's get this bill reauthorized today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUL-LIVAN). The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, we have been promised repeatedly since the end of June that we would be given an opportunity to reopen the Ex-Im Bank, that we would be given the tools to get the Ex-Im Bank operating and providing credit to American manufacturers.

If you had told me that the end of July would come and go without putting the Bank back in business, I would have said: That won't happen.

If you had told me that we would go through all of August and all of September without putting the Bank back in business, I would not have thought that could happen.

We are now at the end of October and, quite frankly, we are at the end of our patience—and so are American manufacturers and so are American workers. The time to deal with reopening the Bank, the time to move this legislation is right now.

The patience has run thin. The promises have never materialized in terms of moving this forward.

We were told in the very early stages, back when we began to move this issue, that the only way we could possibly get it through the House of Representatives was if it were put on a must-pass piece of legislation, something such as the reauthorization of the surface transportation bill—whether we are going to have highway bills or whether we are going to put it on the debt limit or whatever it is—because the House couldn't possibly move this legislation forward without any opportunity to put it on something else.

That myth has disappeared. That theory is no longer available. That argument is no longer available to anyone in this Chamber. So the question becomes this: Now that we know the will of the Congress, reflecting the needs of the American people, the needs of the manufacturers in this country, and now that we know what the vote count is, why can't we get this done? Why would we tell the American public that in the face of an overwhelming majority in support of a critical piece of trade infrastructure and

legislation that we can't get it done, that we have to wait even more months to see the Ex-Im Bank back in business?

We will be back. We will continue to talk about this issue. We will continue to raise the concerns that we have about further delay and what that further delay is costing. But we also are extremely grateful for the work that was done in the House of Representatives against great odds to move this forward, to send a message to American manufacturers: Yes, this place can function, and we will listen to you, and we are moving forward on getting you this critical tool to keep people once again employed in your shops, to keep people once again working to export the great American products to the global economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip is recognized.

LEGISLATION IN CONGRESS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, after years of hard work the Senate yesterday passed legislation that will help keep the personal information of people safer, whether that personal information is in the hands of your bank or your credit card holder or whomever.

As we know, the threat of cyber attacks is all too real. Twenty-one million Americans lost their personal information and sensitive background information at the Office of Personnel Management just this last summer—21 million. As a matter of fact, the suggestion has been made that many of those people were individuals who filed extensive questionnaires—or responses to extensive questionnaires—in order to obtain a security clearance. So you can imagine the sensitivity of that information. That followed on a breach at the Internal Revenue Service in which the data of more than 100,000 taxpayers was stolen.

It is a felony to divulge Federal income tax information of a taxpayer. It is a felony. Yet somehow, some way, this cyber attack at the IRS was able to get data on more than 100,000 taxpayers.

The Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act is legislation that has been long overdue, and we are, frankly, behind the curve here. But this bill garnered wide bipartisan support in the Senate. Now we have the opportunity to work with our House colleagues, who have, I believe, a couple of cybersecurity bills, and to try to reconcile those differences in a conference committee, which is typically the way we reconcile those differences and competing ideas.

But suffice it to say that this legislation, once enacted into law and signed by the President, will help deter future cyber attacks and equip the public and private sector with the tools they need to be more nimble. Specifically, what it will do is allow companies and individuals to share information with the

government without concern about losing a competitive advantage. Right now, when you are attacked in your company, obviously it is not something you particularly want to brag about, but you do need to let the people whose information has been stolen know so they can protect themselves. But what there will be is more information sharing, along with some legal protections for people who cooperate on a voluntary basis.

As Senator BURR, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee said time and again, there is nothing compulsory about this system. Nobody is forced to participate. But I think, over the long run, businesses and individuals will find it in their best interest to share this information and to receive information in a way that will help protect our personal data.

The passage of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act was, rightly, a major priority for the Senate. As I said, I am hopeful—along with our House colleagues—that we can get a bill to the President's desk for signature soon.

But this is just one more example—the latest example, really—of the productivity of this new majority in Congress that was elected just last November. We have worked hard. Without sacrificing our principles, we have worked hard to find common ground, working on a bipartisan basis to move legislation across the floor and to get it enacted into law that serves the best interests of the American people, such as the passage of the bill to help victims of human trafficking, which passed 99 to 0 in the Senate and now is the law of the land. It was the first major effort to help the victims of human trafficking we have undertaken here in 25 years.

We have also passed out of the Senate—and we are working on differences with the House—the Every Child Achieves Act. As Chairman ALEXANDER of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee points out, this is a fix to No Child Left Behind. This legislation will devolve power from Washington, DC, back to parents and local communities so they can have a greater say in their children's education.

Once again we have learned the lesson, perhaps painfully, that a one-size-fits-all solution does not work for everyone. We are a big, diverse country. A lot of communities are better equipped—certainly they are more nimble, more flexible, and more adaptive—to change circumstances than the Federal Government. Even though we had the best of intentions with No Child Left Behind, we needed to make this necessary fix and again devolve power back from the Federal Government down to parents and local communities for their children's education while maintaining high standards at the same time.

We have also passed a multiyear highway bill. I think there were more than 30 different temporary patches of

our highway bill because of the inadequacy of the highway trust fund. When you buy a gallon of gasoline, I think about 18 cents goes into the highway trust fund out of that gallon of gasoline. Unfortunately, though, our demands have exceeded the amount of money in that fund.

For States such as mine, we are a donor State. So we send a buck to Washington, DC, and we get 92 cents back. A friend of mine in the Texas Legislature called that Federal money laundering, and I think he is right.

But we have stepped up—the voters in Texas last year, actually—by passing a supplemental appropriations for highway and infrastructure out of our rainy-day fund. Actually, on November 7, we will have another referendum in Texas to try to fill that gap between what the Federal Government is doing and what the State government can and must do in order to meet our transportation needs.

By passing a multiyear highway bill, the Senate has now prompted our House colleagues to, in turn, pass their own multiyear highway bill, and now, perhaps later today, we will pass another short extension to November 20 and then work to reconcile those two differences and then get that to the President's desk.

That is not particularly sexy work, but it is very important. It is sort of what we are supposed to do in the Congress, which is to perform the task of governing and helping to address the issues that confront everyday working American families.

Then just last week the Senate Judiciary Committee voted 15 to 5 to pass, on a broad bipartisan basis, the first criminal justice reform that we have done since the 1990s. I have cosponsored that legislation and was proud to do so. A lot of what this bill contains—particularly something called the CORRECTIONS Act—was based on a successful experiment in Texas and other States where they realized that you could lock people up for committing crimes but someday they are going to get out. When they do, we have an interest in making sure, for those who are willing, that they are prepared for life on the outside or otherwise they end up becoming what a young man in Houston just last week or so told me. He called himself a “frequent flier” in the criminal justice system. We know what that means. That means the turnstile just kept turning. He would get out and go right back in because he was woefully unprepared for life outside. So whether it is education, whether it is mental illness issues, drug and alcohol issues or just employable skills, it is in our interest to provide incentives to people in prison so they are better prepared when they get out.

I am not suggesting that this is some sort of panacea and that all of a sudden our prisons will be emptied and people won't commit crimes anymore. That is not true. But for those who can be saved, for people who want a helping

hand and are willing to take responsibility for their own rehabilitation, I think this legislation is very important.

So while we still have a lot to do, I think we can take some satisfaction in the productivity that we have had—withstanding the very challenging political environment and the polarization of our politics in America today.

This week Members from both parties, as well as the White House, have been talking about legislation to deal with our budget and ensure our country meets its financial responsibilities. Indeed, there has been an announced deal, negotiated by the leadership in the House, the Senate, and the White House, which the House of Representatives will be voting on at about 5 p.m. today.

I think it is worth reminding everybody how we got to this point. Starting in June, our colleagues from across the aisle started what they advertised as a filibuster summer—in other words, a strategy to block any and all of the appropriations bills that come across the Senate floor. There are 12 of those appropriations bills. If we were doing things the way we should be, we would take them up individually. The American people could read them, understand them, and we could debate them, hopefully improve them, and then pass them into law to fund some of the basic functions of our government, such as the Defense Department, for example. It is ironic that many of these appropriations bills sailed through the Appropriations Committee on a bipartisan basis.

Well, for the first time in 6 years, the Committee on Appropriations had voted out all 12 of those bills. The reason they were able to do so is because under this new majority, we were able to actually pass a new budget, which gave the top capped spending lines to the Appropriations Committee so they could do their job to consider those spending bills, to rearrange priorities, and hopefully gain greater efficiency and economize on the spending.

So even though many of our Democratic friends voted for those bills in the Appropriations Committee, they came to the floor and voted against them to create this huge cliff that we knew was coming on November 3 and, indeed, on December 11.

Senate Democrats carried this strategy of filibuster summer into the fall and continued to block appropriations bills, turning noncontroversial funding priorities, such as our Nation's military and support for our veterans, into partisan games. That is what created this so-called shutdown narrative and drama.

It wasn't an accident; it was a premeditated plan by our Democratic friends in the minority. So, as a result, Congress was once again staring down several major deadlines with little time to waste.

I have to say that if your attitude in Congress is “I want 100 percent of what

I want or I am not going to settle for anything,” you are not going to get anything. It is just that simple. It is just a simple fact of life that the only kind of negotiated outcomes we have here are imperfect; they are flawed.

While this budget agreement isn't perfect—it is flawed—it does contain several important priorities. First of all, the Budget Act of 2015 doesn't raise taxes. That is important to me and certainly important to my constituents. They think this administration has raised their taxes more than enough already. This agreement lays the foundation to fund the government through 2017 without a tax increase.

Importantly, the legislation repeals a section of ObamaCare. We will have more to say about that in this coming weeks, but it repeals a major section of ObamaCare that required large employers to automatically enroll their employees in the ObamaCare health plans. That is a pretty big deal for a law that has been on the books since 2010. Rolling back ObamaCare, I believe, is essential to helping the American people meet their basic needs—to get the health care they want at a price they can afford, and not based on some sort of mandate from the Federal Government. It is also necessary for the health of our Nation's economy.

Perhaps from my standpoint, and I suspect the Presiding Officer's standpoint, the single most important part of this legislation is it will fund our military and make sure our military has the resources it needs to protect us here at home and our allies around the world.

As part of the artificial drama that was created over this deal, the President of the United States vetoed the National Defense Authorization Act. This is the fundamental law by which Congress says to our men and women in uniform: We are going to make sure you have the resources you need in order to do the job you volunteered to do. And oh, by the way, we are also going to take care of our families because in the military today, with an all-volunteer military, our military families are vitally important too. But in an incredibly cynical move, the President vetoed the Defense authorization bill in order to gain leverage in this negotiated budget deal. It truly is shameful. It is inexcusable for the Commander in Chief to hold our men and women in uniform hostage by doing something like that.

We all know we are living in a world marked by insecurity at every corner, from rampant instability in the Middle East to a newly aggressive Russia in Eastern Europe and in the Arctic, and a rising China that continues to—Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 more minutes.

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

Mr. CORNYN. In addition to instability in the Middle East and an aggressive Russia in Eastern Europe and in the Arctic, a rising China is trying

to expand its own territory at the expense of our allies and friends in the Pacific.

I am glad to see the U.S. Navy challenge the phony claims of China in the South China Sea that jeopardize those important sea lanes that are so critical to our security and to our commerce.

So this deal, as flawed as it is, finally provides the military and our military families with the resources they need in order to do the incredibly important job we ask them to do. If you think about all the areas that the Federal Government is involved in, this is the No. 1 priority. There is no “Yellow Pages” where you can look to outsource national security. It is the Federal Government’s responsibility, and it is about time we provided our men and women in uniform with the resources they need in order to get the job done.

In conclusion, this bill actually takes significant steps in reforming, in a fiscally responsible manner, our Social Security disability system. It will provide long-term savings from changes to Social Security. In fact, this will represent the first bipartisan reform we have had since the early 1980s.

I look forward to continuing to discuss this legislation with our colleagues and finding a way to move forward as we face the big challenges still ahead of us in the Senate. The only alternative to this negotiated deal would be a clean debt ceiling increase and a continuing resolution at current spending levels, which would have a devastating impact on our military and our national security.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 8 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein and with the time equally divided in the usual form; further, that all time during quorum calls be charged equally between both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank. I know some of my colleagues were here earlier, and I wanted to join them, but I was at a hearing over in commerce. I do want to thank Senators CANTWELL and KIRK for their leadership on this issue. I also want to thank my colleagues, Senators HEITKAMP, SHAHEEN, MIKULSKI, and BOXER, who were on the floor today voicing their strong and continued support for the Ex-Im Bank.

Yesterday, the House voted 313 to 118 to reauthorize the Export-Import

Bank. That is a strong bipartisan vote that included a majority of Republicans. It included seven of the eight Members of the congressional delegation from the State of Minnesota, including several Republicans.

The Ex-Im Bank also has bipartisan support here in the Senate, which has voted twice this year to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank, both times with more than 60 votes. Now it is time for the Senate to take up this bill and vote to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank with no further delay. This year, the Senate has been in the lead on this. We have shown the kind of bipartisan support that helped the House to get the numbers they needed, and now we must simply pass the bill.

The Ex-Im Bank has been reauthorized 16 times in its 81-year history, every time with a broad bipartisan majority. As yesterday’s House vote and previous votes in the Senate show, the Ex-Im Bank still has the support of a broad bipartisan majority.

Since coming to the Senate, I have been working to boost America’s ability to compete in the global economy. I serve on the President’s Export Council. I believe America needs to be a country that once again thinks, invents things, and exports to the world. We like our financial industry—we have the sixth biggest bank in the country out of Minnesota—but we all know we can’t simply rely on the financial industry to keep the economy going. The economy has to be a bread-and-butter economy, and that means making things, and that means exports.

When 95 percent of the world’s customers live outside of our borders, there is literally a world of opportunity out there for U.S. businesses. U.S. exports have helped expand our economy over the past 4 years, reaching an alltime high of \$2.3 trillion, an increase of 34 percent since 2009 after inflation.

We know there are about 85 credit export agencies in 60 other countries, including every exporting country in the world. Our businesses are competing against these foreign businesses, which are backed by their own countries’ credit export programs and often receive other government subsidies. Why would we want to make it harder for our own companies to compete in a world where all the other exporting nations have an export-type bank financing authority? When our companies are competing against overseas companies for contracts, they need the Ex-Im Bank.

In 2014, the Ex-Im Bank provided support for \$27 billion worth of U.S. exports. This sounds like a lot, but in the same year China financed more than double that amount—\$58 billion compared to \$27 billion—and South Korea and Germany also provided more support for their exports. If we don’t get this done, Mr. President, China will eat our lunch.

If we want a level playing field for our businesses, we need to have the

U.S. Ex-Im Bank open and running. Do you know what our companies find out right now? Well, the charter has lapsed. When these U.S. companies or our foreign competitors go to the Ex-Im Bank Web site, do you know what they see on the Web site? I will tell you. I went to the Web site and saw it myself. It says this: “Due to a lapse in EXIM Bank’s authority, as of July 1, 2015, the Bank is unable to process applications or engage in new business or other prohibited activities.” Every one of our foreign competitors knows this is up on our own U.S. Web site.

To me, this is about jobs. As the ranking member of the Joint Economic Committee, I know that in 2014 the Ex-Im Bank provided \$20.5 billion in financing. That supported 164,000 jobs. I know there are hundreds of companies in Minnesota—I think the exact number is 170—that use financing authority. The vast majority of them are small companies. These small business owners, like many small business owners all across the country, know it is essential for their ability to export. They can’t have a full-time bank person in their small companies. They can’t have a full-time expert on trade with various countries—Kazakhstan, you name it—all around the world. They need the help of the Ex-Im Bank to know how to get this financing.

I visit all 87 counties in my State every year, and a lot of that time is spent visiting these small businesses. Even when I don’t mean to find an Ex-Im-type business, I find one. I heard from Fastenal and Miller Ingenuity, both from Winona. I have heard from EJ Ajax Metalforming, a leader in workforce policies. So everywhere from Fastenal to PERMAC, an award-winning women-run manufacturer in Burnsville, I have found that Minnesota businesses get help from Ex-Im Bank.

The time is here. We can’t put it off any longer. Our colleagues in the House, despite the fact that they didn’t even know if they had a Speaker for a number of weeks, were able to pass this bill. Now it is our turn. Let’s get this done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

PUBLIC EXPRESSIONS OF FAITH

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, it is just past the middle of football season in America—a sad thing for a lot of us who are football fans. This is the time when some fans are thinking seriously about the playoffs and other fans start thinking seriously about trying to get their coach fired.

In Bremerton, WA, coach Joe Kennedy is in trouble not because the team has a losing record but because he has the audacity to kneel down and pray on the 50-yard line after the football games are over and thank God for the chance to coach there and for the safety of his players.