

S. 1126

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1126, a bill to modify and extend the National Guard State Partnership Program.

S. 1130

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1130, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve procedures for legal justice for members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 1176

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1176, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the system of public financing for Presidential elections, and for other purposes.

S. 1214

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1214, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 1239

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1239, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for the Reid vapor pressure limitations under that Act.

S. 1300

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1300, a bill to amend the section 221 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide relief for adoptive families from immigrant visa feeds in certain situations.

S. 1312

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1312, a bill to modernize Federal policies regarding the supply and distribution of energy in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1334

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1334, a bill to strengthen enforcement mechanisms to stop illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing, to amend the Tuna Conventions Act of 1950 to implement the Antigua Convention, and for other purposes.

S. 1345

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr.

KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1345, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes self-management training by authorizing certified diabetes educators to provide diabetes self-management training services, including as part of telehealth services, under part B of the Medicare program.

S. 1377

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1377, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify and expand Federal criminal jurisdiction over Federal contractors and employees outside the United States, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 143

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 143, a resolution supporting efforts to ensure that students have access to debt-free higher education.

S. RES. 148

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 148, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

AMENDMENT NO. 1227

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1227 proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1299

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1299 proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1369

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1369 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right

to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1370

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1370 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1390

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1390 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1411

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1411 proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1395. A bill to reinstate certain mining claims in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to reintroduce legislation in a dramatically different form to reinstate two small miner's claims, which have been taken from them because of an inequitable federal administrative process.

Under revisions to the Federal Mining Law of 1872, 30 U.S.C. 28(f) holders of unpatented mineral claims must pay a claim maintenance fee originally set at \$100 per claim by a deadline, set by regulation, of September 1 each year. Since 2004 that fee has risen to \$140 per claim. But Congress also provided a claim maintenance fee waiver for "small" miners, those who hold 10 or fewer claims, so that they do not have to submit the fee, but that they must file to renew their claims and submit an affidavit of annual labor, work conducted on the claim, each year, certifying that they had performed more

than \$100 of work on the claim in the preceding year, 30 U.S.C. 28f(d)(1). The waiver provision further states: "If a small miner waiver application is determined to be defective for any reason, the claimant shall have a period of 60 days after receipt of written notification of the defect or defects by the Bureau of Land Management to: A) cure such defect or defects or (B) pay the . . . claim maintenance fee(s) due for such a period."

Since past revisions of the law, there have been a series of incidents where miners have argued that they submitted their applications and affidavits of annual labor in a timely manner, but due to clerical error by U.S. Bureau of Land Management staff, mailing delays or for unexplained reasons, the applications or documents were not recorded as having been received in a timely fashion. In that case BLM has terminated the claims, deeming them null and void. While mining claim holders have argued that the law provides them time to cure claim defects, BLM has argued that the cure only applies when applications or fees have been received in a timely manner. Thus, there is no administrative remedy for miners who believe that clerical errors by BLM or mail issues resulted in loss or the late recording of claim extension applications and paperwork.

There have been a number of cases where Congress has been asked to override BLM determinations and reinstate mining claims simply because of the disputes over whether the claims had been filed in a timely manner. Congress in 2003 reinstated such claims in a previous Alaska case. Claims in two other incidents were reinstated following a U.S. District Court case in the 10th Circuit first in 2009 in the case of *Miller v. United States* and in a second Alaska case in 2013. Legislation to correct the provision to prevent this problem actually was approved by the Senate in 2007, but did not ultimately become law.

In the past three Congresses I have introduced legislation intended to short circuit continued litigation and pleas for claim reinstatement by clarifying the intent of Congress that miners do have to be informed that their claims are in jeopardy of being voided and given 60 days of notice to cure defects, including giving them time to submit their applications and to submit affidavits of annual labor, should their submittals not be received and processed by BLM officials on time. If all defects are not cured within 60 days—the obvious intent of Congress in passing the original act—then claims should be subject to voidance. But this administration has opposed the legislation arguing that it would be too expensive to notify all small miners who fail to file their small miner waiver documents on time and giving them time to solve the defect prior to the loss of their claims. It has even been suggested that giving small miners

simple due process would just encourage miners to ignore the deadline for filing of their fee waivers.

I clearly find the cost argument unpersuasive. Many Federal departments and agencies, the Federal Communication Commission, as one example, routinely sends out notices on permit and license applications. The FCC sends out hundreds of thousands of such notices to Americans who have small radio licenses expiring yearly, warning them that they need to file applications for license renewal. The Bureau of Land Management certainly should be able to afford a few hundred stamps to perform a similar service. Given the value of claims placed at risk and the bother, inconvenience and fear of loss of claims, it is highly unlikely that miners would avoid filing their waiver paperwork on time just because a notification process was clearly in place before claims could be terminated.

But after facing the clear opposition of this administration over 6 years to resolving this inequity, today I simply file legislation to remedy the injustices for two of my constituents who have lost their rights, in one case to nine mineral claims on the Kenai Peninsula, near Hope, Alaska, and in the second case to a single placer claim in the Fortymile District of northeast Alaska. The transition language proposed will reinstate claims for Mr. John Trautner, who has lost title to claims that he had held from 1982 to 2004. Mr. Trautner suffered this loss even though he had a consistent record of having paid the annual labor assessment fee for the previous 22 years. The local BLM office did have a time-date-stamped record that the maintenance fee waiver certification form had been filed weeks before the deadline, but just not a record that the affidavit of annual labor had arrived when he dropped it at the office in Anchorage at the same time.

In the second case, it will reinstate a claim held by Mr. and Mrs. Vernon Thurneau, now of Wasilla, who lost their claim after mining it continuously for 38 years in 2009, simply because of a holiday season error. In this case the Thurneau's paid their fees on time, and turned in their proof of labor affidavit to the Fairbanks Records Office in December before the deadline. They received a time and date stamp that they produced the information in a timely manner. But because of the Christmas holidays they simply forgot to turn/mail in the form to the BLM Anchorage office until after Jan. 1, missing the BLM's required Dec. 31 deadline. Because of a holiday delay, they lost their claims and 38 years of work.

This legislation, supported in the past by the Alaska Miners Association, will simply reinstate the two sets of claims, claims that have been held by the government over the past decade. In response to complaints by the Department of the Interior that past

versions of my legislation improperly would have resulted in the patenting of the claims by the granting of a first half final certificate in the Trautner case, I have modified this bill simply to reinstate the claims, but not to take steps to confirm patents. By this bill Mr. Trautner will have to wait like many other miners for Congress to reconsider the merits of the moratorium on patent issuance first imposed on the Mining Law of 1872 by Congress in 1995.

It is simple justice that Mr. Trautner and the Thurneau family receive their claims back, since Congress clearly thought it was giving miners a guaranteed opportunity to remedy claim defects when it created the small miner waiver provisions in 1993. Return of the claims will cost the government nothing and likely will result in added federal revenues, hopefully preventing this bill from facing any procedural issues. I hope that justice will finally prevail in these cases this Congress, even though I regret that I see no means to fix the larger inequity in the interpretation of the small miner waiver statute for the foreseeable future.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 1397. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that ITIN applicants submit their application in person at taxpayer assistance centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1397

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "ITIN Reform Act of 2015".

#### SEC. 2. REQUIREMENTS FOR THE ISSUANCE OF ITINS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6109 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(i) SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO THE ISSUANCE OF ITINS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may issue an individual taxpayer identification number to an individual only if the requirements of paragraphs (2) and (3) are met.

"(2) IN-PERSON APPLICATION.—The requirements of this paragraph are met if, with respect to an application for an individual taxpayer identification number—

"(A) the applicant submits an application in person, using Form W-7 (or any successor thereof) and including the required documentation, at a taxpayer assistance center of the Internal Revenue Service, or

"(B) in the case of an applicant who resides outside of the United States, the applicant submits the application in person to an employee of the Internal Revenue Service or a designee of the Secretary at a United States diplomatic mission or consular post, together with the required documentation.

"(3) INITIAL ON-SITE VERIFICATION OF DOCUMENTATION.—The requirements of this paragraph are met if, with respect to each application, an employee of the Internal Revenue Service at the taxpayer assistance center, or

the employee or designee described in paragraph (2)(B), as the case may be, conducts an initial verification of the documentation supporting the application submitted under paragraph (2).

“(4) REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) required documentation includes such documentation as the Secretary may require that proves the individual’s identity and foreign status, and

“(B) the Secretary may only accept original documents.

“(5) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(A) MILITARY SPOUSES.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the spouse, or the dependents, without a social security number of a taxpayer who is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States.

“(B) TREATY BENEFITS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a nonresident alien applying for an individual taxpayer identification number for the purpose of claiming tax treaty benefits.

“(6) TERM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An individual taxpayer identification number issued after the date of the enactment of this subsection shall be valid only for the 5-year period which includes the taxable year of the individual for which such number is issued and the 4 succeeding taxable years.

“(B) RENEWAL OF ITIN.—Such number shall be valid for an additional 5-year period only if it is renewed through an application which satisfies the requirements under paragraphs (2) and (3).

“(C) SPECIAL RULE FOR EXISTING ITINS.—In the case of an individual with an individual taxpayer identification number issued on or before the date of the enactment of this subsection, such number shall not be valid after the earlier of—

“(i) the end of the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subsection, or

“(ii) the first taxable year beginning after—

“(I) the date of the enactment of this subsection, and

“(II) any taxable year for which the individual (or, if a dependent, on which the individual is included) did not make a return.”.

(b) INTEREST.—Section 6611 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i) and by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection:

“(h) SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO ITINS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, no interest shall be allowed or paid to or on behalf of an individual with respect to any overpayment until 45 days after an individual taxpayer identification number is issued to the individual.”.

(c) AUDIT BY TIGTA.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration shall conduct an audit of the program of the Internal Revenue Service for the issuance of individual taxpayer identification numbers pursuant to section 6109(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. The report required by this subsection shall be submitted to the Congress.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) SUBSECTION (a).—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to requests for individual taxpayer identification numbers made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) SUBSECTION (b).—The amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply to returns due, claims filed, and refunds paid after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 1400. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to direct the task force of the Office of Veterans Business Development to provide access to and manage the distribution of excess or surplus property to veteran-owned small businesses; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1400

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Veterans Small Business Enhancement Act of 2015”.

#### SEC. 2. ACCESS TO EXCESS OR SURPLUS PROPERTY FOR VETERAN-OWNED SMALL BUSINESSES.

Section 32(c)(3)(B) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657b(c)(3)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (v), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in clause (vi), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(vii) providing access to and managing the distribution of excess or surplus property owned by the United States to small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans, pursuant to a memorandum of understanding between the task force and the head of the applicable state agency (as defined in section 549 of title 40, United States Code).”.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR):

S. 1401. A bill to provide for the annual designation of cities in the United States as an “American World War II City”; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce legislation to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to designate one city each year as a World War II city, beginning with Wilmington, NC, as America’s first World War II City.

The names of the 10,000 Tarheels, who paid the ultimate price in World War II are memorialized on the bulkhead of the battleship USS North Carolina in downtown Wilmington.

During World War II, the USS North Carolina, known affectionately throughout the Navy as the “Showboat”, participated in every major naval offensive in the Pacific area of operations and earned 15 battle stars. She steamed over 300,000 miles. Although Japanese radio claimed six times that North Carolina had been sunk, she survived.

After serving as a training vessel for midshipmen, North Carolina was decommissioned June 27, 1947 and placed in the Inactive Reserve Fleet in Bayonne, New Jersey, for the next 14 years. In 1958 the announcement of her impending scrapping led to a statewide campaign by citizens of North Carolina to save the ship and bring her back to her home state. The Save Our Ship,

SOS, campaign was successful and the battleship arrived in her current berth on October 2, 1961. She was dedicated on April 29, 1962, as the State’s memorial to its World War II veterans

At home, North Carolina’s coast was a war zone. On April 13–14, 1942, the first U-boat, German U-85, was sunk off the North Carolina Coast. Mr. President, 397 ships were sunk or damaged and nearly 5,000 people were killed within sight of our shores. For 6 months at the beginning of America’s war, 65 German U-boats hunted Allied merchant vessels practically unopposed. The greatest concentration of these attacks came off North Carolina.

During World War II, Wilmington was the home of the North Carolina Shipbuilding Company. The shipyard was created as part of the U.S. Government’s Emergency Shipbuilding Program. Workers built 243 ships in Wilmington during the five years the company operated.

The city was the site of three prisoner-of-war, POW, camps from February 1944 through April 1946. At their peak, the camps held 550 German prisoners. The first camp was located on the corner of Shipyard Boulevard and Carolina Beach Road; the old Confederate post Fort Fisher housed German prisoners and also served as a training site for the Coastal Artillery and anti-aircraft units. A smaller contingent of prisoners was assigned to a smaller site, working in the officers’ mess and doing grounds keeping at Blumenthal Army Air Field, which is now Wilmington International Airport. Blumenthal Army Air Field was used by the United States Army Air Forces’ Third Air Force for antisubmarine patrols and training.

I want to thank my colleague Senator BURR for bringing this idea to establish a process to recognize Wilmington and other American cities for their efforts during the war years, to the Senate. But I also wish to single out Wilbur Jones, a Wilmington native and military historian who has poured so much of his time and soul into ensuring that the people of southeastern North Carolina never forget the contributions of our state to victory in the Atlantic and the Pacific.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1402. A bill to allow acceleration certificates awarded under the Patents for Humanity Program to be transferable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the American intellectual property system is rightly held as the global standard for promoting innovation and driving economic growth. This is particularly true of our patent system. The fundamental truth that our Founders recognized more than 200 years ago, that limited exclusive rights for inventors incentivize research and development, continues to benefit consumers and the American economy at large.

A healthy patent system should do more than drive economic development; it should incentivize research and discoveries that advance humanitarian needs. I have worked to promote policies that encourage intellectual property holders to apply their work to address global humanitarian challenges. Today, I continue that effort by joining with Senator GRASSLEY to introduce the bipartisan Patents for Humanity Program Improvement Act.

This bipartisan legislation strengthens a program created by the United States Patent and Trademark Office, PTO, in 2012. The PTO's Patents for Humanity Program provides rewards to selected patent holders who use their invention to address a humanitarian issue that significantly affects the public health or quality of life of an impoverished population. Those who receive the award are given a certificate to accelerate certain PTO processes, as described in the program rules.

The innovations that have been recognized by this program help underserved people throughout the world. Award winners have worked to improve the treatment and diagnosis of devastating diseases, improve nutrition and the environment, and combat the spread of dangerous counterfeit drugs. These are innovations that will make a real difference in the lives of people who are not always the beneficiaries of cutting-edge technology.

Following a Judiciary Committee hearing in 2012, I asked then-PTO Director Kappos whether the Patents for Humanity program would be more effective, and more attractive to innovators, if the acceleration certificates awarded were transferable to a third party. He responded that it would, and that it would be particularly beneficial to small businesses that win the award. Since that time, other small start-ups and global health groups have emphasized that making the certificates transferable would improve their usability and increase the incentives of the Patents for Humanity Award. The Patents for Humanity Program Improvement Act makes this enhancement to the program. It is a straightforward, cost-neutral bill that will strengthen this award and encourage innovations to be used for humanitarian goods.

When Congress can establish policies that provide business incentives for humanitarian endeavors, it should not hesitate to act. I urge the Senate to work swiftly to pass this legislation.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 17—ESTABLISHING A JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE TO ADDRESS REGULATORY REFORM

Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HOEVEN, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted the following

concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

#### S. CON. RES. 17

Whereas there are more than 3,500 rules issued every year by more than 50 Federal agencies;

Whereas a rule is defined in section 551 of title 5, United States Code, as “the whole or part of an agency statement of general or particular applicability and future effect designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy”;

Whereas subchapter II of chapter 5, and chapter 7, of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the “Administrative Procedure Act”) established standards for the issuance of rules using formal rulemaking and informal rulemaking procedures;

Whereas informal rulemaking, also known as “notice and comment” rulemaking or “section 553” rulemaking, is the most common type of rulemaking;

Whereas in rulemaking proceedings, formal hearings must be held and interested parties must be given the chance to comment on the proposed rule or regulation, and once adopted, the rule or regulation is required to be published in the Federal Register;

Whereas, according to a 2005 study commissioned by the Small Business Administration, the cost of all rules in effect was approximately \$1,100,000,000 per year, more than the people of the United States paid in Federal income taxes in 2009;

Whereas, according to the 2014 Ten Thousand Commandments report by the Competitive Enterprise Institute, the top 6 Federal rulemaking agencies (which, in 2013, were the Departments of the Treasury, Commerce, Interior, Health and Human Services, and Transportation and the Environmental Protection Agency) account for 49.3 percent of all Federal rules;

Whereas, according to the 2014 Ten Thousand Commandments report by the Competitive Enterprise Institute, small businesses pay more in per-employee regulatory costs, and firms with fewer than 20 employees pay an average of \$10,585 per employee, compared to \$7,755 for those with 500 or more employees;

Whereas, according to the 2014 Ten Thousand Commandments report by the Competitive Enterprise Institute, regulatory costs amount to an average of \$14,974 per household, which is 23 percent of the average household income of \$65,596 and 29 percent of the expenditure budget of \$51,442;

Whereas, according to a 2011 study by the Weidenbaum Center at Washington University, it is estimated that the budgetary cost of administering and enforcing Federal regulations by Federal agencies for fiscal year 2012 amounted to more than \$57 billion (in 2005 dollars), which represents a 10.5 percent increase in 2 years;

Whereas chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the “Congressional Review Act”) established a mechanism through which Congress could overturn Federal regulations by enacting a joint resolution of disapproval;

Whereas the Congressional Review Act requires that rules that have a \$100,000,000 effect or more on the economy are submitted by agencies to both Houses of Congress and the Government Accountability Office and have a delayed effective date of not less than 60 days to pass a resolution of disapproval rejecting the rule, which must be approved by the President; and

Whereas, since the enactment of the Congressional Review Act in 1996, the procedures

under the Act have been used 1 time to overturn a rule: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This resolution may be cited as the “Regulation Sensibility Through Oversight Restoration Resolution of 2015” or the “RESTORE Resolution of 2015”.

#### SEC. 2. JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON REGULATORY REFORM.

There is established a joint select committee to be known as the Joint Select Committee on Regulatory Reform (hereinafter in this concurrent resolution referred to as the “Joint Select Committee”).

#### SEC. 3. DUTIES OF JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “agency” and “rule” have the meanings given those terms in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) DUTIES.—The Joint Select Committee shall—

(1) conduct a systematic review of the process by which rules are promulgated by agencies;

(2) hold hearings on the effects of and how to reduce regulatory overreach in all sectors of the economy;

(3) conduct a review of the Code of Federal Regulations to identify rules and sets of rules that should be repealed; and

(4) submit to the Senate and the House of Representatives—

(A) recommendations for legislation—

(i) to create a process under which an agency, before promulgating a rule, shall—

(I) seek advice from Congress;

(II) publish the proposed rule;

(III) hold a public comment period on the proposed rule;

(IV) seek advice from Congress based on the public comments; and

(V) hold issuance of the rule until Congress can review the rule for a period of not more than 1 year; and

(ii) to create a process to appropriately sunset as many rules as possible;

(B) recommendations for ways to reduce the financial burden placed on the various sectors of the economy in order to comply with rules;

(C) an analysis of the feasibility of the creation of a permanent Joint Committee on Rules Review in accordance with subsection (c);

(D) an analysis of the feasibility of requiring each agency to submit each proposed rule of the agency to the appropriate committees of Congress for review in a similar manner as set forth for a permanent Joint Committee on Rules Review under subsection (c); and

(E) a list of rules and sets of rules that the Joint Select Committee recommends should be repealed.

(c) ANALYSIS OF PERMANENT JOINT COMMITTEE ON RULES REVIEW.—The Joint Select Committee shall analyze the feasibility of the creation of a permanent Joint Committee on Rules Review. The Joint Committee on Rules Review would—

(1) review each proposed rule that an agency determines is likely to have an annual effect on the economy of \$50,000,000 or more before the agency promulgates the final rule;

(2) require each agency to submit to the Committee—

(A) the text of each proposed rule of the agency described in paragraph (1); and

(B) an analysis of the economic impact of the rule on the economy;

(3) require each agency to revise a proposed rule submitted under paragraph (2) if the Committee determines that the proposed rule—