

would have done that last Congress easily. We were prevented from doing so.

The repeal of Medicare's sustainable growth rate. We call it SGR. We would have done that at any time, Mr. President. There are no great shakes here. How did we get it done? It wasn't paid for. Why? Because it was a budget gimmick in the first place, during the Bush years.

So to hear my friend the Republican leader coming and boasting about all this stuff getting done, we could have done—most of it could have been done two Congresses ago. Certainly in the last Congress we should have gotten it done.

The extension of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act—the PATRIOT Act. We knew it had to be done. We tried to get it done last Congress but couldn't get it done. We were prevented from doing so.

Now it is the same with the elementary and secondary education bill. I am glad we are on this and glad to complete this other stuff, but let's not try to rewrite history, Mr. President. These things could have been done easily had they not been filibustered here on the Senate floor. Any one of these bills would have easily passed in the last Congress, but every one of them was blocked by Republicans.

MANUFACTURED CRISES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we hear the phrase "manufactured crisis" used a lot here lately. Why? The Republican leader gives people plenty of reason to use the term. He has singlehandedly turned the entire appropriations process into a charade designed to manufacture yet another crisis.

Look no further than what Republicans are doing in the interior, environment appropriations bill. The Republican leader bragged yesterday—today is Thursday, so on Wednesday—that he and his colleagues have "lined the interior appropriations bill with every rider you can think of to push back against them."

They have filled that legislation with so-called riders. What is a rider? It is an extraneous provision that has nothing to do with the purpose of the bill—in this instance, a funding bill. So they have filled that legislation, the interior appropriations bill, and other bills that have nothing to do with funding the government with things that are harmful to our country.

For example, in the appropriations bill dealing with the interior, Republicans have included language to permanently dismantle efforts to address climate change by blocking Federal enforcement of a nationwide policy to reduce carbon pollution from existing powerplants.

Climate change is very hurtful to our economy and hurtful to our country.

I was at an event at the White House two nights ago. The President said that if we don't do something about climate

change by the year 2100, the seas will have increased by 16 feet. The State of Florida will basically be half underwater.

Prior to 2100, it is already getting bad. Talk to the two Senators from Virginia. Areas that are military installations are now covered with water most of the time. Talk to my friend the senior Senator from Florida, and he will tell you what is happening in Florida now. Talk to the Governor of New York, and he will tell you what happened with Sandy, the hurricane. It is going to happen again because we are doing nothing to prevent climate change from devastating our country. The Presiding Officer is from the State of Nevada, as am I. He knows that bears—not all bears but many bears are not even hibernating in the Sierras anymore because it is not cold enough. Talk to one of the Senators from New Hampshire. The moose are being devastated. Why? Because the cold weather is not killing the gnats, the fleas on the moose, and they are dying. About a third of them are dead.

So climate change is not serious? It is a serious issue. Of course it is.

Republicans have riders in this bill dealing with clean water. They have stuck in language to permanently block implementation of protections for streams and wetlands that have the greatest impact on our Nation's water quality.

Ozone pollution is another rider they slipped in there. They slipped in language to delay efforts to protect people from lung diseases and asthma, among other things.

Hazardous waste cleanup—now, this is unique. They stuck language in this bill affecting Superfund sites. This has been a great program. It has been a great program because people who devastate and pollute the land are asked to pay to clean it up. Republicans have stuck language in here to have the taxpayers clean this up and pay for it. That is stunning to me.

This is a perfect example of Republicans manufacturing a crisis. They have loaded up a necessary funding measure with dangerous provisions that have doomed these bills. Then when Democrats oppose it, the Republican leader will feign outrage and blame Democrats for its failure, hoping to score some type of political victory.

Republicans know an appropriations bill full of riders that roll back environmental protections will be stopped by us and vetoed by the President. This scripted performance is the definition of a manufactured crisis. And the Republican leader said as much last year in an interview with the Hill newspaper Politico. Here is what he said:

Obama needs to be challenged, and the best way to do that is through the funding process. He would have to make a decision on a given bill, whether there's more in it that he likes than dislikes. A good example is adding restrictions to regulations from the Environmental Protection Agency. Adding riders to spending bills would change the behavior of the bureaucracy.

He promised that last year, and he is a man of his word. He is ruining every one of these appropriations bills with these riders, in spite of more asthma, more heart disease, more cancer.

Instead of passing appropriations bills that keep our government open and funded, the Republican leader is more interested in making Democrats and Republicans not work together and having the President and Democrats very uncomfortable. Sadly, this is how Republicans are governing. This is how they pretend to lead our country. It is embarrassing. I believe it is. Look at the poll numbers to see what is happening. The Republican leader's numbers are the lowest they have ever been recorded.

It doesn't have to be this way. With the help of a handful of reasonable Republicans, we can sidestep this sham and pass meaningful legislation that averts another government shutdown. The first one was promoted and engineered by the Republicans.

I said yesterday and I repeat, Mr. President, to show how shameful that was, two-thirds of the Republicans in the House voted to keep the government closed. I mentioned yesterday how the Republican chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, Congressman HAL ROGERS—whom people call the Dean of the Kentucky delegation—is calling on his party to work with us Democrats on a long-term solution that avoids a government shutdown. We need Republicans like him here in the Senate.

In just a few months, the government will run out of money. It will have no more money on October 1. Unless we can reach a bipartisan budget agreement, our Nation will face another ridiculous and damaging government shutdown. So I urge my Republican friends—especially Republican leaders in both Houses—to listen to Chairman ROGERS and those other members of the Committee on Appropriations and work together. Put aside these non-serious games and get serious about keeping our government open. It is the only way Congress will avoid another manufactured crisis the Republican leader seems so desperately to desire.

WASHINGTON FOOTBALL TEAM NAME

Mr. REID. Mr. President, finally, yesterday the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia affirmed what Native Americans have been saying for decades—the Washington football team name is disparaging. It is racist and morally objectionable, and it should be changed now.

U.S. District Court Judge Gerald Bruce Lee sustained the Patent and Trademark Office's decision that the Washington football team name should not be protected by a Federal trademark registration. That is good news. But how did the Redskins respond? Sorry to use that name. I made a mistake. How did the Washington football

team respond? By saying: Well, our football team is worth a lot of money, and as part of that value, the Redskins name is worth some money.

I mean, does Daniel Snyder have enough money? I think so, without disparaging the group of Indians we have in Nevada—22 separate tribal entities in Nevada. They do not like this. Snyder tried a couple of things—bought them a car and thought they would back off and no longer object. They saw that one coming, and they said: No, you keep the car.

What the judge did yesterday is good news. The Federal Government should not protect a team or company that takes pride in hearing a racial slur every time their name is mentioned.

While the ruling is a step in the right direction, this battle is not over. Ultimately, the response will rest with the owner, Dan Snyder, a multibillionaire. The U.S. Government cannot change his team's name; only he can. For far too long, owner Snyder has tried to hide behind tradition, but yesterday's ruling makes clear that his franchise's name only fosters a tradition of racism, bigotry, and intolerance.

I admire so very much the Republican Governor of South Carolina. She has all the conservative credentials anyone needs, and after that terrible incident at a church in her State, she said the Confederate flag is going to go. Yesterday, after a long debate, as I understand it, the South Carolina Legislature said no more public display of the flag. So tradition is not the name of the game. Fairness—not racism, not bigotry, not intolerance—is the game.

Dan Snyder should do the right thing and change the team's name. There is no place for that kind of tradition in the National Football League, and there is certainly no place for it in our great country.

Mr. President, I apologize to my friend the chairman of the committee for taking so much time.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

EVERY CHILD ACHIEVES ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1177, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1177) to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves.

Pending:

Alexander/Murray amendment No. 2089, in the nature of a substitute.

Alexander (for Fischer) amendment No. 2079 (to amendment No. 2089), to ensure local governance of education.

Murray (for Peters) amendment No. 2095 (to amendment No. 2089), to allow local educational agencies to use parent and family

engagement funds for financial literacy activities.

Toomey amendment No. 2094 (to amendment No. 2089), to protect our children from convicted pedophiles, child molesters, and other sex offenders infiltrating our schools and from schools "passing the trash"—helping pedophiles obtain jobs at other schools.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, the Democratic leader and the Republican leader have created an environment in which we can succeed on this bill, and I am grateful to them for that. I listened to their remarks this morning about some things that have gone on in the past in the Senate. My late friend Alex Haley, the author of "Roots," used to say: Find the good and praise it. And so what I would like to do is thank the majority leader for putting the bill on the floor. Only he can do that and give us a chance to debate it. I thank the Democratic leader for creating an environment in which we can have a large number of amendments and succeed.

I thank the Senator from Washington, Mrs. PATTY MURRAY, who suggested the way we proceed today. We fell into some partisan differences in the last two Congresses that made that impossible, and she has, as much as anybody, helped solve that problem.

We are making good progress. We have adopted a number of amendments. We voted on some others. Some have passed, and some have been defeated. People have had a chance to have their say. Senator MURRAY and I have received a large number of amendments—several dozen, actually, that Senators on both sides have offered—that we have agreed to recommend to the full Senate we adopt by consent.

In addition to that, we adopted 29 amendments in the committee consideration, and many of those were amendments from Democratic Members of the Senate. So I think most Senators—in fact, I haven't heard a single one say that they haven't had a chance to have their say on No Child Left Behind.

Yesterday, I put into the RECORD an op-ed from the Washington Post by the Virginia Secretary of Education Anne Holton, who made the argument that States, like Virginia, are well prepared to accept the responsibility for higher standards, better teaching, and real accountability. Over the last 15 years, that has happened in every State.

It reminds us that this bill we are debating only provides 4 percent of the dollars that pay for our 100,000 public schools in the country. We have some other money that the Federal Government spends—4 percent or 5 percent more—for those schools, but this bill spends 4 percent. Most of the money, most of the responsibility, most of the opportunity for success is with parents, classroom teachers, and others who are close to the children.

The consensus we have developed, the bipartisan consensus—again, with the bill Senator MURRAY and I put together

and improved by our committee and now being improved on the floor—is that while we keep the important measures of the accountability, so we know what children in South Dakota and Tennessee and Washington State are learning and not learning, so we can tell if anyone is left behind, that we restore to States the responsibility for figuring out what to do about the tests. That has broad-scale support.

Superintendents were in town yesterday from all over the country; they told us that. Governors are calling us; they tell us that. The major teachers organizations in the country tell us we do not need, in effect, a national school board. Those decisions need to be made by teachers who cherish the children in their classroom and the parents who put them there and school board members who care for them and Governors and legislators who are closer to home. So this bill isn't easy to do, but because of that consensus, we are making good progress.

I will submit following my remarks an article from earlier this week from Newsweek entitled, "The Education Law Everyone Wants to Fix." The House of Representatives said it wants to fix it last night. The progress we are making suggests the Senate wants to fix it. We know all across the country Governors, legislators, teachers, school superintendents, and parents want to end the confusion and anxiety in the 100,000 public schools.

We will be having more votes, hopefully today just before lunch, and then we will continue with the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, the article from Newsweek entitled "The Education Law Everyone Wants to Fix" be printed in the RECORD.

On a different subject, which I will not elaborate on today, I wish to also include, following my remarks, an article I wrote for the Wall Street Journal yesterday about the cost of going to college. I think it is unfortunate that so many politicians and pundits say that Americans can't afford college when in fact most of them can. It is never easy, but it is important for them to know that for low-income Americans, for example, the first 2 years of college are free or nearly free at a community college; and there are many other ways colleges, universities, the Federal Government, and taxpayers try to make it easy for a larger number of Americans to go to college. That is a debate Senator MURRAY and I are already working on. We will bring the reauthorization of the higher education bill before the Senate hopefully later this year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my op-ed from the Wall Street Journal be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. President, there are a number of Senators who wish to come to the floor to speak today. I encourage any Senator who hasn't presented their amendment to go ahead and do that. I am