

Mr. COATS. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?
Ms. HEITKAMP. Sure.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 1986

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I am very excited about the Kirk-Heitkamp amendment getting an overwhelming show of support. The reality is that if we do not vote on the Kirk-Heitkamp bill itself and pass it out of this Chamber, at the end of this month, the charter for the Ex-Im Bank will expire.

This vote has nothing to do with the charter for the Ex-Im Bank. It does nothing to prevent the charter for the Ex-Im Bank from expiring. This is at a time when China and India are pumping billions of dollars into their export credit agency. This is at a time when we have \$15 billion worth of credit waiting to move through the Ex-Im Bank so we create jobs here in our country—jobs for American workers—and we are stalling the Bank.

When we had this discussion during the TPA debate, we wanted to have a vote that would guarantee we would have an opportunity to prevent the charter for the Ex-Im Bank from expiring. That is not this vote today.

I am extraordinarily gratified by the show of support because what it really does tell us is if we bring up an Ex-Im Bank bill on its own—an extension bill on its own—we will be able to prevent something from happening that could have catastrophic economic results in this country. So I urge this body to find a path forward to prevent the Ex-Im Bank charter from expiring, to have a path forward to honor our commitments that were made during an earlier vote so we can have a vote and actually move this bill forward and not simply have a vote to show support but actually pass a bill.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield for a question?

Ms. HEITKAMP. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator for her comments and I ask her this question: So that we understand the procedure that just took place, there was an amendment offered that would have extended the Ex-Im Bank and then a motion to table it, and I believe 60 Members or more voted against the motion to table, which shows a positive sentiment about extending the Ex-Im Bank charter. After that vote, the sponsors of the amendment withdrew the amendment from this bill.

So at this moment in time, I wish to ask the Senator, for absolute clarity: We have nothing before us that would extend the Ex-Im Bank either in this bill or in any other manner before the end of June when it expires; is that correct?

Ms. HEITKAMP. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. DURBIN. And that creates a disadvantage for businesses in Illinois, and I am sure in North Dakota, in terms of exports and jobs, and unless we do take this seriously and quickly, they will be jeopardized.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I think the other thing it does also is it is a signal to all of those companies we are competing with, whether it is China or India, that we are out of the business, and that opens a wide path for them to be in the business of exports. So this takes us out of the business of financing exports, which is going to have and will have catastrophic results. We don't have a path forward, and the charter of the Bank expires at the end of this month. Without a path forward, we are opening an opportunity for our competitors to take those exports and to take away our opportunity to have those jobs.

So I am very gratified by the result of this vote because I think it signals support for Ex-Im Bank. When we get this kind of support from the U.S. Senate—almost veto-proof support—maybe we ought to move the bill. People will say there isn't an opportunity to do that; there is no path forward. Let me tell my colleagues that there is no one in the country who believes that is true. If there is a will, there is a way.

We have to have a vote on the Export-Import Bank by the end of the month and get it over to the House so the House can support it and move this forward or we will be playing chicken with the exports of the United States of America.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Ms. HEITKAMP. Yes.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Senator AYOTTE, in offering this amendment, talked about a forum in New Hampshire at General Electric where a number of small businesses participated. Senator CANTWELL and I were at that forum. We heard testimony from an employee of a company called Goss International, which makes large printing presses and competes mostly with Germany but with countries around the world. One of the issues she spoke about is that they have \$10 million in deals that are sitting on the table at Ex-Im that they need to have approved before the end of June when the authorization expires. If those don't get approved, they are not going to be able to create 45 new jobs they are talking about being able to create as part of that deal.

So if the authorization for Ex-Im expires, not only is Goss going to have trouble with those jobs, but companies across this country are going to lose jobs that would be created if those fi-

nancing deals could go through; isn't that the case?

Ms. HEITKAMP. In fact, the case is nearly \$16 billion worth of American business and American exports that create American jobs will languish in the pipeline at the Ex-Im Bank because we foolishly let a charter expire at a time when we are in competition for exports, a competition for commerce throughout the world.

When we debated trade promotion—and a lot of us took some tough votes on TPA—we were promised a vote that would be mutually agreed upon here so we could advance the Ex-Im Bank by the end of June. We haven't gotten that vote because today all we did was show—I think rightfully so—that we have tremendous support in this body for the Ex-Im Bank and we shouldn't be held hostage to the narrow ideology of a few.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Ms. HEITKAMP. Yes.

Ms. CANTWELL. The Senator from North Dakota has obviously been working so hard on this in the Banking Committee, and she understands, I believe, that when the Bank expires on June 30, there is about \$12 billion of approved deals that are in the process, and they will not be approved while the Bank is not operating; is that correct?

Ms. HEITKAMP. That is correct. The last number I was given, I say to my friend, the Senator from Washington, was almost \$5.5 billion.

Ms. CANTWELL. So today's vote is a symbolic vote but does nothing to help us resolve the issue for getting this approved before June 30.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Unfortunately, too often we have symbolic votes that don't have real consequences in the real world. Our wonderful businesses that are outcompeting and outmanufacturing and outresearching the rest of the world are now with their hands tied behind their backs and losing credits as we stand.

Ms. CANTWELL. Are there a lot of small businesses in South Dakota that are a part of this export economy?

I say that because I think a lot of people get the impression that this is about big manufacturers. I have always said those guys will take care of themselves; they have lots of people here to take care of them. But the small people who will actually lose business on June 30 don't have people here and that is why we are fighting so hard to get a vote before June 30 that actually will go over to the House on a vehicle.

Ms. HEITKAMP. We have companies in Wahpeton, ND, where bankruptcy has been prevented because they have been able to find their way to the Ex-Im Bank and actually find their way to a credit relationship with their importers.

We have a company in West Fargo that builds portable wheelchair ramps and they have saturated the market here and they are marketing these all

over the country. They will tell us today and tell anyone who will listen that the only reason they are as successful as they are is because of the credit agency, the Export-Import Bank.

Ms. CANTWELL. I thank the Senator for her leadership in committee. As she said, with 65 votes, we can do a lot of things to get this legislation out of here, so we will certainly be looking for those opportunities.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Ms. HEITKAMP. I will.

Mrs. BOXER. First, before I ask my question, I wish to thank Senator HEITKAMP and Senator CANTWELL and Senator SHAHEEN. These three women have been just stalwart on this. We were on different sides on the trade vote, and I remember how hard they pushed for a real commitment, which I think in good faith they believed they got.

I am afraid what we saw here tonight is quite cynical. It doesn't do anything. I don't get what the point was.

Wouldn't it be far better if we got a commitment from the majority leader to set aside some time right after this bill—certainly before the end of this month, because as Senator CANTWELL always tells us, the end of the month is the end of the Bank.

So if we could get a commitment, I am asking my friend, would she be willing to agree to a time agreement so we wouldn't have to take up days and days and days to get this reauthorization done?

Ms. HEITKAMP. Absolutely. I think we have a vehicle, as we can say, for the Kirk-Heitkamp bill, which was, in fact, this amendment we just voted on. We have overwhelming support in the Senate. We will do anything we can to move this authorization forward because without it we are costing American jobs.

Mrs. BOXER. Another point I wish to make to my friend is I don't know if she is aware, but California has well over \$1 billion of projects on the line. Even in our State, that is significant.

I just wanted to thank her and Senators CANTWELL and SHAHEEN and others who have worked so hard. I have been here a long time, and I know a cynical ploy when I see it. I just saw it.

I know how easy it is to resolve this problem. You have an overwhelming, filibuster-proof number of people who want this Bank reauthorized. All you probably need is an hour or so. Anytime night or day, we will come in. I would hope and I would ask my friend if she and her colleagues will pursue a meeting or ask directly at some point in time for a commitment to take this up and, within a reasonable time limit, get it done.

In my State, many jobs are dependent on this, and all across the Nation, as you have eloquently pointed out, as well as Senators CANTWELL and SHAHEEN. I thank you for your leadership.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I thank my friend from California.

I would say that as much as relationships here matter, what matters more to me is Americans working. What matters more to me are the jobs that will be lost and the opportunities that will be lost, as these manufacturing facilities and as these great innovative manufacturers have worked so hard. Think about all the work that is behind almost \$16 billion worth of credit, all the relationships. All of a sudden, they have to say to their customer: Guess what. I am not there.

I would suggest that one of the most heart-wrenching stories I have heard about the loss already of a big deal came out of California—a 100-percent disabled vet who told us he has already lost \$57 million and he is on a path to lose a \$200 million deal out of the Philippines, and that means jobs, jobs, jobs.

In California, jobs matter. In North Dakota, jobs matter. All across this country, jobs matter. If we can start putting the focus on jobs and the American worker first instead of ideology and politics, if we stop playing games, we can get things done here.

What was interesting to me is people say: Well, there is no path forward.

Really? I think that if we needed a bill passed, if, in fact, we were in a spot where in 2 weeks or 2-plus weeks we were going to lose the charter of the Ex-Im Bank—and we are in that spot. If you really care about the Ex-Im Bank, if you really care about American jobs, you would figure out a way to pass this bill out of the Senate for which we have 65 votes.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

(The remarks of Mr. WHITEHOUSE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1548 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO JANET BURRELL

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I wish to honor and thank Janet Burrell for her 37 years of talented and dedicated public service upon her retirement from the Senate. Her career in the Senate spans an impressive array of issues and responsibilities—all of which she met with grace, skill, and good cheer. For the last 16 years, Janet has served as the office administrator for the Democratic staff of the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Janet started her career in the Senate on the Committee on Finance in

1985 as a staff assistant. She and her colleagues worked around the clock—taking shifts, day and night—to help enact the mammoth and historic Tax Reform Act of 1986. From the Committee on Finance, she moved to the Committee on Environment and Public Works and, finally, to the Committee on Governmental Affairs, which is now the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Over her 30 years of service in the Senate, Janet worked on teams tackling a wide range of legislation, moving from the Tax Reform Act of 1986 to the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 to the creation of the Department of Homeland Security in 2003. She has worked for six Senators over the years, including both Republicans and Democrats, in both the majority and the minority, and even in a Senate evenly split between Democrats and Republicans.

Along the way in her Senate career, Janet learned and mastered a broad array of new skills from managing human resources to operating computers to learning the intricacies of how to make a committee run smoothly. She was the office administrator of the now-Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs during the 9/11 terrorist attacks, when anthrax was discovered in the Senate, and even during an earthquake. The challenges were difficult and diverse but Janet rose to every task. Among other things, at the time of the anthrax incident, Janet supervised the young staff who opened the mail. In that capacity, it was among her responsibilities to calm the fears of the staff and their worried parents. She was also responsible for figuring out evacuation drills for scenarios like a biological attack, terrorist attack, or active shooter—risks that few could have envisioned when she started with the committee 16 years ago. Janet also helped shape Senate history. Beginning in 2004, she played an instrumental role in orchestrating the committee's transition from the Governmental Affairs Committee to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Prior to serving in the Senate, Janet worked in the House of Representatives for my former colleague, Ralph H. Regula of Ohio, and she served 7 years in the executive branch at the U.S. Office of Government Ethics and at the U.S. General Services Administration.

In every office that she was a part of, Janet acted as a force of calm and generosity at the center of chaotic day-to-day, week-to-week schedules. Her colleagues are quick to share stories of times when Janet went above and beyond the call of duty to make someone's day smoother. In fact, they tell me that her selflessness and kindness was reflected in every task she took on. One of Janet's former staff directors said that Janet, "always did whatever had to be done to make sure that