

Senator THUNE did everything he could to fulfill the commitment. He was having pressure not to do anything, I am sure, but he called his committee together. He is the chairman of the Commerce Committee. He reported Rosenworcel out to the Senate floor. There his authority stops. He doesn't have any power to do any more. He did what he felt he was obligated to do, and I felt he was obligated to do. It is now Senator MCCONNELL's problem, I guess. But a year went by. She still wasn't sent to the floor. That is when I talked to Senator THUNE—the first of many times. He did what he said he would do and reported her out.

A few months ago, in December of 2015, a year after we had made our agreement, I reminded Senator MCCONNELL of his commitment to do what he said he would do to quickly advance the nomination. He told me that the Senate would confirm her when we returned in 2016. January 2016 passed with no action. Before we left for the President's Day recess, I spoke again with Senators MCCONNELL and THUNE about Rosenworcel's nomination. February passed with no movement. March passed. Here we are, 21 days into April, with no confirmation.

I have waited. I have waited patiently for my friend to do the right thing. I have held off for months coming to the floor. What else would I do? What else could I do? I held off, hoping the Republican leader would deliver on the pledge that he gave to me.

I spoke again with him yesterday on the telephone, urging him to move her forward. He said to me: We'll do it next year. Next year she is out of a job. Her term expires at the end of this year. Her career will basically be over because of my accepting my counterpart's word. I told the Republican leader and I told Senator THUNE that I would not remain silent forever on this. I told both of them yesterday I was going to come to the floor.

The Republican leader, I hope, was aware of the words of Bob Dole, which I talked about earlier in my remarks. Dole said:

I knew that nothing else I did would matter very much if I ever forfeited the trust of my colleagues. As we all learn around here, if you don't keep your word, it doesn't make much difference what agenda you try to advance.

That was Robert Dole.

To say I am disappointed is an understatement. This is a commitment that was made to me about a year and a half ago. We have to keep our trust. This isn't an issue of my being offended. I have been offended. The Presiding Officer has been offended. We have all been offended. This isn't only personal with me, in taking the Republican leader's promise as a personal affront. It is not a personal affront to me. If it is, I will have to bear that. I think it is, but I can handle that. What I am concerned about is what it means for the Senate and what it means for a human being, a woman who works very hard every

day, trying to do the right thing for a very important part of our country.

I understand the Republican leader has a tough job. I know that. I had that job a lot longer than he has. Because of the dysfunction in his caucus, it is difficult, I am told and as we see, for him to get things done. But that is no excuse for someone not keeping their word. He could go into executive session. We would agree to that. He could file cloture. He could do this in many different ways.

I still expect him to live up to his commitment and get Commissioner Rosenworcel confirmed. I don't want this to be a bad time for the Senate if it continues. It is a bad day for the Senate now because you have to keep your word. That is all we have around here.

I see no one on the floor, and I will ask the Chair to announce what the Senate is going to do the rest of the day.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Missouri.

#### ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS BILL AND WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the bill that is on the floor. The very fact that we have this bill on the floor deserves some attention. We have an appropriations bill on the energy and water responsibilities of the Federal Government. I think this is the first time this bill has been on the Senate floor in 7 years.

With the current majority, the Appropriations Committee is 1 month ahead of any time in recent history that bills have been marked up and brought to the floor. The majority leader set aside 12 weeks to do the work that for decades—in fact, for a couple of centuries—was the core work of what the Congress did. The Congress set the priorities of the country by having an open and free debate on how the Congress and the country would spend the money that was entrusted to the Congress—the long-ranging discussion of the power of the purse. You know, you don't have to be a great student of American history to say: Well, don't you men and women in the Congress have the power of the purse? Well, we do have it, according to the Constitution, but we have not had it in the practice of the last 6 or 7 years when the work of the Congress simply

was not done in a way that people could see what was going on or that Members could freely weigh in.

One of the things about the debate we are having on this Energy and Water bill is that any Member of the Senate can come to the floor and they can say: Don't spend this money at all. In this bill, spend the money here rather than there. They can say some combination of those two things, and then the Senate votes on that before we approve the final bill.

I am pleased that we are debating this bill. That may actually be more important than the bill itself. But the bill itself is important as well.

This bill provides the critical resources to support the safety and long-term viability of our waterway systems. One of the reasons we are so competitive internationally and so competitive in our own domestic economy is that we have had the ability to use the waterways of the country—particularly the internal as well as the external waterways—in a way that makes us more competitive than we would be otherwise.

Our inland waterways in particular are critical to economic growth. We are right on the edge of a time when world food demand doubles from the Presiding Officer's State, from my State. Agriculture, which is the biggest economic sector of the economy, is in a great position not only to meet those food needs in our country but to meet food needs worldwide. That position is dramatically enhanced if we have a transportation system that doesn't just include highways and doesn't just include railroads but also includes the waterways of the country.

Another thing our two States have had in common—the Upper Missouri and the Lower Missouri—is the devastating challenges that flooding can present. This bill makes it possible for us to deal with flood control and navigation. Once again, this emphasizes that the Corps of Engineers can't just say these are the top two priorities of managing the Mississippi River Valley system, particularly the Missouri and Mississippi, but those really need to be apparent in their commitment to both flood control and navigation as things we want to do.

I am pleased this bill prioritizes things like the bank stabilization and navigation project on the Mississippi River, the tributaries project that is central to our flood control efforts in our State. I am also glad the bill increases funding for small ports and harbors to serve as vital places for us to compete.

You know, the inland ports are basically export ports. There is nothing wrong with buying things from other people, but it is better to sell things to other people. The inland ports serve a geographic area that is roughly twice as big as the coastal ports. That doesn't mean there is anything wrong with the coastal ports; it just means, let's get realistic about where we are

making investments that allow us to compete. If a coastal port effectively really supports an area, say, 300 miles inland from that coastal port, an inland port supports an area 300 miles in all directions. So this is an effective thing for us to do.

Also, we need to ensure that we are looking at our port systems as a system, not just as one individual port. The old days of the Congress being able to say "This is what you want to do in this port or this harbor" are now being replaced by being sure the Corps of Engineers understands its responsibility to do this.

Another agency that needs to understand its reasonable responsibility is the EPA. So once again I am on the floor for the third time in about as many months—and heaven knows how many times in the last several years—talking about this incredible overreach EPA is making when they want to decide they don't want to change the law that says navigable waters of the United States are under the authority of the Environmental Protection Agency—not a new concept in law at all.

Navigable waters have seemed to be a Federal responsibility since the 1840s in law, in bills that have passed the Congress. So in the early 1970s, the Clean Water Act was passed, and the EPA was formed. The Clean Water Act said the EPA will have jurisdiction over navigable waters. But with this outrageous waters of the United States rule, the EPA wants to now define "navigable waters" as basically all the water in the country.

They want to say it is any water that can run into any water that can run into any water. I don't know how many iterations of that there would be that can run into any water that eventually runs into navigable water. There is a case before the Supreme Court right now where the EPA is challenging a company in Minnesota based on navigable waters. The location they are challenging is 120 miles away, by no argument, from the nearest thing that anybody would truly consider a navigable water.

The Farm Bureau in Missouri has a map that I have brought to the floor now a number of times—the Farm Bureau map of where the jurisdiction of the EPA would be under waters of the United States. This is anything that deals with water: a building permit, runoff from your driveway, resurfacing a parking lot, fertilizer on a farm field, drilling a hole for a utility pole. Anything that involves water, theoretically, under this rule, could come under the jurisdiction of the EPA.

In my State, anything that would meet the EPA definition of what could be the definition of their new sense of waters of the United States covers 99.7 percent of the State.

The Presiding Officer is a little further from this map. He may not be able to see the two dozen white dots on the map that would clearly still under the jurisdiction of the State of Missouri or

under the jurisdiction of a county government or under the jurisdiction of a city. That would be three-tenths of 1 percent.

Senator HOEVEN, who has fought to not allow this rule to go forward, as I have since the day it was proposed, has once again proposed an amendment to this bill. We all get to vote on it. A majority of the Senate has shown its concern about this particular regulation, this outlandish regulation—enough that the Senate and the House have put a bill on the President's desk in the last few months that the President vetoed, which said: Don't go forward with this regulation.

What this amendment says is: No money can be spent to go forward with this regulation. I certainly encourage my colleagues to once again step up, as they are already on the record as having been willing to do, to stop this regulation. This amendment—the way to stop this regulation is to say that no money can be spent to move forward with this regulation, which a majority of the Congress, Democrats and Republicans, organizations all over America, government at virtually every level, county governments, city governments, and State governments, have said they don't want. The Attorney Generals of about half of the States have a case before the Supreme Court. But none of that seems to get through to the all-knowing EPA on this issue.

Today I urge my colleagues to once again step up and say: We want this stopped.

One way to stop it is not to have any money available to move forward with this outlandish rule.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

#### SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS MONTH

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, April is actually Sexual Assault Awareness Month, and I rise to speak about two extraordinary women who were accepted into their dream colleges and then after they arrived on campus were sexually assaulted. They tried to seek help from their school, and they were blamed for their assaults by their school's administrators.

A couple of years ago, these two young women walked into my office. They didn't have an appointment. They didn't have any connections on Capitol Hill. They certainly didn't have an expensive lobbyist to lead them in. Annie and Andrea had heard about my work to fight sexual assaults in the military, and they simply wanted to help.

The same crisis was unfolding on college campuses across the country. When they tried to report their rapes, they were not believed. They were actually retaliated against. For them, justice seemed impossible. But instead of doing nothing, Annie and Andrea joined together and they created an organization called End Rape on Campus.

They took their stories to college campus after college campus to be heard, to help other survivors like themselves, to make a difference, to achieve justice, and to hold these schools accountable.

Together, Annie and Andrea have helped many other sexual assault survivors file dozens of title IX complaints for how their schools mishandled their sexual assault claims. These young women are changing lives. They are helping their peers find justice. They took a risk to raise their voices, and now we are closer than ever to passing a comprehensive, bipartisan piece of legislation to make sure campus sexual assault cases are handled with the professionalism and fairness all our students deserve. We are closer than ever to passing a bill that would finally give our colleges and universities an incentive to solve the problem of sexual assault rather than stay silent and pretend it doesn't exist because they are worried about application numbers or press releases.

I urge all of my colleagues in the Senate to support this bipartisan bill, the Campus Accountability and Safety Act, because when surveys keep confirming that one out of five of our women in college are sexually assaulted before they graduate, we know we have more work to do. We need to follow the example of Annie and Andrea and speak out about this crisis.

I am going to use this moment to tell one story—the story of Andrea, what actually happened to her. She wrote a book with Annie called "We Believe You." It is an incredible compilation of survivor stories. It is quite heart-breaking and very tough to read, but it is one of the most inspiring books I have ever read. There are thousands of stories just like hers. I have others to tell on the Senate floor, but now I am going to tell you Andrea's in her own words:

After I publicly came forward as a survivor, I learned that the biggest triggers aren't actually the nightmares of my assault, but the nightmares of the betrayals that I've had to survive.

When the media tells your story, it feels like open season on your truth. It's exposed to commentary, and a part of you loses control over it, and the vulnerabilities that you intended to share.

When you tell your story to the media, you're at the mercy of their portrayal, and the portrayal of others.

I've been betrayed by friends who struggled to understand what happened to me, and to accept that the same person who put forth strength and composure could fall apart.

I wish I could have said the right things to get them to understand that I was broken, and that my confidence was a lie to both of us.

I've been betrayed by the university that I love so dearly, whose seal I wear around my neck, and whose quads and bricks hold pieces of me—pieces of who I was before, and of who I am today.

Andrea is one of many young men and women whose lives have been shattered by a violent sexual crime and then shattered again by a second betrayal when their schools chose not to